

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VI.

DECEMBER 1850.

PART XXXVI.

THE HIERARCHY.

IF we may judge by its periodical organs, the Protestant world has received the tidings that England has been divided by the Pope into Catholic dioceses with the same ignorant terror with which it ordinarily views every act of the Catholic Church. Ignorance and terror are, in fact, the heralds which announce the onward march of the army of Almighty God. Ere we lift up our voice, or move a solitary step, the mysterious agency is at its work, and in accents of mingled rage and fear the spirit of the world confesses the advent of One whom it dare not deny to be its invincible Master. With the rarest exceptions—and perhaps with no real exceptions at all—the same phenomenon is *every where* witnessed. Men dread us, and hate us, and know nothing of us. While the language of contempt still bursts from their lips, their hearts palpitate with alarm. They scorn to study us with patience, yet tremble before us as something more than human. At once childish and consummately prudent, at once powerless and terrible, at once derided by modern intelligence and denounced as its most dreaded enemy,—we present the same marvellous aspect that our fathers presented, and which they received as a legacy from Him whom the world mocked at as a fool, and persecuted as an irresistible foe.

A more striking example of the workings of the genuine Protestant spirit has rarely been called out than that which has resulted from the nomination of an English Catholic hierarchy. Of the real character of the new regulations, Englishmen in general are profoundly ignorant. What the Pope means by it;—whether it is a claim to all the stolen Church-property in the hands of Anglican prelates and nobles; whether it implies that Queen Victoria is not lawful sovereign of this realm; whether Protestants are in any way

affected in their domestic and personal capacities; whether an Act of Parliament would not put an abrupt end to the arrangement; whether English Catholics like it or dislike it; whether, lastly, the Pope and the Cardinals are knaves, or fools, or madmen: into all this, our respectable countrymen will not give themselves an hour's trouble to inquire. If the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy were of no more importance than the squabbles of some obscure Methodist meeting, the country at large could scarcely bestow less pains in ascertaining what it means, why it has been accomplished, and what will be its results.

Yet are the fifteen thousand rectors and curates of the twelve thousand Anglican churches and chapels, together with all the members of their congregations who trouble themselves about politics or theology, and together with many Dissenting preachers, and their multitudinous flocks, just now shaking in their shoes at the thought of what has been done, and wondering what next is to come to pass. No one can disguise his dislike and dread of the measure. The philosophical Socinian, who accounts it impossible that Popery should not wither before the breath of modern science; the contemptuous Anglican, who turns up his nose at "Romanist and other Dissenters," and would no more fraternise with a Cardinal than with an inspired shoemaker; the better-informed politician and diplomatist, who has worn off his antipopish prejudices in intercourse with distinguished Catholics at home and abroad; not even these can dissemble their apprehensions, or treat the work as other than an ugly fact, betokening the existence of a power in the realm which may yet give them some little trouble to cope with. And between such as these, and the terrified crowd, which sees in every Catholic (or even Puseyite) a Jesuit, and in every Jesuit a murderer, are found the vast mass of Englishmen united in irritation and apprehension of some dark plot against their liberties, civil, political, or spiritual. Whether her most gracious Majesty herself in any degree shares the apprehensions of her Protestant subjects, we know not; but we venture to believe that she is wiser than the race whom she governs; and that if she should hear of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster holding a levee in her capital, she will feel no more apprehension for the safety of her throne, or for the loyalty of English Catholics, than when she reads of the dinners given by the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury in his gorgeous palace at Lambeth.

What the establishment of the hierarchy really is, and what results we ourselves, as Catholics, anticipate from it,

our Protestant readers (who, we trust, are not the least intelligent of the non-catholic body) may, however, be glad to learn, at the expense of a brief half-hour's study of the following pages. It effects, then, no change in the relation of English Catholics, or of the Pope, or of any Catholic whatsoever, towards the Sovereign and Protestant people of England. It is simply a matter of private arrangement among Catholics themselves, and is the substitution of the *ordinary* government of the Catholic Church throughout the world for that *temporary* government which was necessitated by the past condition of Catholic affairs since the Reformation. The Pope, our Protestant readers should be aware—and they will bear in mind that we are not now arguing the question between Catholicism and Protestantism, but simply stating historical facts—the Pope claims to act not merely as head of the whole Church, but as local Bishop in every part of the world where no episcopal see has been as yet established, or where—as in England at the Reformation—the existence of episcopal sees has been for a time suspended. He is thus not only the source of all missionary action in heathen and Protestant countries, but wherever Catholics are found in such countries, he governs them as their local and immediate superior. And this he does by means of what we term Vicars-Apostolic, that is, vicars or vicegerents of the Apostolic See of Rome. Such Vicars-Apostolic are generally consecrated Bishops of some ancient Christian see, where Catholics are no longer found, or are found in extremely small numbers; and hence they are termed Bishops of dioceses *in partibus infidelium*. The assignment of the see where any Bishop shall exercise his jurisdiction, rests, by the law of the Catholic Church, with the Pope. His Holiness, therefore, can, at pleasure, either cease to fill up a vacant see altogether (as in the case of the English sees after the Reformation), or he can nominate a Bishop to a see, and give him episcopal jurisdiction elsewhere, or he can entirely abolish the old diocesan arrangements of any country, and re-partition it into new dioceses. This last is what he has just done for England. When the old Catholic sees fell into the hands of the Protestants at the Reformation, the Catholic Church simply left things as they were. The ancient divisions remained in theory, but they were not acted upon. The right to act upon them, and to appoint fresh Catholic Bishops to the Protestantised sees, was never for a moment given up. The prelates of the Anglican Establishment were and are viewed as holding the *temporalities* of those dioceses, but as having no spiritual charge whatsoever over the souls of the inhabitants in the sight of Al-

mighty God. The Catholic Church regards them as usurpers in a twofold way: first, they are mere laymen, ordained and consecrated by other laymen, without a valid succession from the Apostles; and secondly, even if they were personally consecrated Bishops, they would be usurpers of jurisdiction. They exercise their jurisdiction over their several sees solely through the will and power of a temporal monarch and an Act of Parliament, which are no more the sources of jurisdiction in spiritual things than they are sources of the laws of gravity. We *call* them bishops, it is true, just as we call the Anglican clergy "reverend." But this is a mere act of courtesy, and means nothing more than the ecclesiastical titles with which we salute the ministers of the Scotch Kirk, or any Dissenting preacher who is styled "reverend" by his own sect. In the eye of the Catholic Church there is no such a person in existence as an Archbishop of Canterbury or of York, or a Bishop of London, Durham, or any other of the old Catholic sees, and there have been none such for about three hundred years.

"Why, then," the Anglican will interrupt us and ask, "why has this claim on the part of the Pope been so long in abeyance? Why, if he has never ceased to appoint Bishops of Melipotamus, Troy, and a hundred other heathenised places, has he left the illustrious seats of England untenanted?" Simply, we answer, as a matter of prudence. It is a maxim with the Church to run no *needless* risks in her conflict with the lawful powers of the world. No principle was involved in the cessation of the Catholic appointments to the English sees, because the Pope claims a right to suspend, so to say, the existence of any diocese. Little would have been gained by continuing successors to the Catholic prelates, while the fury of persecution would have been redoubled. The faithful could be governed by Vicars-Apostolic until the storm should pass away, and until they should be otherwise in a position to require the ordinary government of the Church. The same prudential considerations have further now induced the Holy See to re-distribute the territory of England into new dioceses, in order to avoid coming into collision with the Act of Parliament which forbids any but the Anglican prelates to assume the titles of their sees. It is not that the Pope, or any Catholic in Christendom, regards that Act of Parliament as any thing but an insult to Almighty God, and as a claim to spiritual rights which He has already bestowed elsewhere. If it were prudent to do so, the Catholic Church might nominate a Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury to-morrow. We consider ourselves no more bound to obey that enactment, as of

lawful authority, than to say, "There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet," because a blood-thirsty and licentious conqueror raised the cry many centuries ago in Eastern countries. A wish to be on good terms, so far as conscience will permit, with the temporal power, is the only reason why Cardinal Wiseman is not at this moment Archbishop of Canterbury.

But here, again, we may be interrupted with the objection that at the best our prudence is but imprudence. The indignant Protestant will ask why the Pope could be so rash and senseless as needlessly to provoke the popular mind by these daring demonstrations of his irritating claims. Why could we not go on as before? it will be said. If no great change is made, why make any change at all? To this we can only reply, that the prudence of any such step must be determined by two considerations, viz. the amount of the anticipated gain, and the amount of the anticipated loss. Until now it *has* been considered that the loss would overbalance the gain. But now the Pope—and all English Catholics (with very few exceptions) rejoice in his Holiness's determination—thinks otherwise. What will be the precise gain to the Catholic body we shall presently state; but we take leave in the mean time to remark, that of its nature and extent none but ourselves can be competent judges. Our affairs are not known to Protestants. They are ignorant of our feelings, our principles, and our expectations, and consequently they must leave it to us to decide for ourselves what we think a sufficient advantage to warrant so important an alteration.

As to the probable loss, of that Protestants, if they would be calm, might be better able to form an opinion. Let them reflect, then, and ask themselves *what* injury *we* are likely to sustain from the establishment of a hierarchy. Of course, that injury must solely arise from the violence and anger of Protestants themselves; and this in a threefold way. It might provoke the re-enactment of persecuting laws; it might reproduce the Gordon riots, or stimulate to other lawless mob-violence against Catholics and their possessions; or it might evoke a tempest of words, filling the press with furious articles and correspondence, and making Protestant houses groan with the echoes of private Anticatholic fulminations. Of these evils the first two are obviously real, and to be avoided; but are they probable, or even possible, in the present day? Is it likely that the present Queen, Lords, and Commons will strip us of our hardly won political privileges, or rob us of our houses and lands? The alternative can scarcely be gravely discussed. The iniquity and absurdity of such a step, as a

punishment for committing no legal offences whatsoever, would be *too* great even for a Protestant Parliament; and her Majesty the Queen is one of the last sovereigns in Europe from whom we should look for such a monstrous tyranny. We do not even account it possible that an Act of Parliament should be passed forbidding Catholic prelates to assume the titles of the *new* sees. But if it were, what then? Who would obey it? Certainly not Catholics. What is it to us what an Act of Parliament decrees in spiritual matters? The new prelates, in the sight of God, and therefore in our sight, would *be* the Bishops of the new sees; and whether we should *call* them so *in public* would depend on the amount of violence used to compel us to silence. In former days, Catholics *were* compelled to adopt a cautious phraseology in speaking of their religious acts. They called hearing Mass "going to prayers;" and in every way, while they *did the thing* which the law forbade, they provoked as little remark as was possible. So, too, to suppose an extreme improbability, we might be forced in public to call the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster merely "Dr. Wiseman," but we should *obey* him as the Archbishop of Westminster notwithstanding. All this is, however, an idle speculation. The penal laws cannot be again enacted and enforced.

Yet we may be mobbed, and our churches burnt. Possibly so; but not more on account of the new hierarchy than for any chance reason wholly distinct. Enlightened, comparatively, as is the popular mind, occasions not unfrequently occur when Catholic priests escape personal violence by a hair's breadth; but these occasions, we are convinced, will be made scarcely at all more common by the new measure of which we are speaking. The *people* care too little for Protestantism to attack Catholics for any *Protestant* reason. A few dissolute idlers can, at any time, get up a riot against any person or any institution; and the falsehoods which are still scattered profusely among the wealthy as well as the poor might at any moment kindle a fierce blaze against us. But as to any disturbances on a large scale, they cannot be; and for the best of reasons—we *are too numerous and too powerful to endure them*. Lord George Gordon's riots would be impossible in the present day. The hundred and eighty or two hundred thousand Catholics who live in London only could quell any popular tumult with their own right arms alone. It will be remembered that at the time when the Chartist riots were anticipated in the metropolis nearly three years ago, the most powerful assistance which was rendered to the Government by the really poor and labouring classes was

given by a numerous body of men termed "coal-whippers," who were duly marshalled and commanded, and who, in case the peace had been broken, would have proved a most formidable obstacle in the way of the seditious. But it was known to few that these very men were, for the most part, Catholics and Irishmen. Yet so it was, and so would it be again. London could, at a brief notice, send forth tens and twenties of thousands of Irish Catholics, who in the cause of order would be the most faithful of the auxiliaries of the Government, and than whom the Queen has not more loyal subjects in the empire; but who in case of any extensive Anticatholic demonstration would crush their foes and trample them under foot. The English nation may rest assured that we are to be *despised* no longer. Woe be to those misguided men who attempt violence against us! We obey the laws of the land in all temporal things gladly, and thanking God for the privileges enjoyed by Englishmen. Should any fearful convulsions, which may God avert, shake this country to her centre, the Catholic body, both English-born and Irish-born, will be the very last to cease fighting in the cause of loyalty and order; in the midst of a never-ceasing pelting of abuse and misrepresentation of our religion and our lives, the instances of Catholic abuse of Protestants are comparatively few: but should a frenzied passion ever again seize the multitude, and stir them up to plot against the sacred persons of our clergy, or the consecrated dwelling-places of our God, there exists a protective power amongst us, which can be summoned to its work in a moment, and which is sufficient to defy the malice of any enemies who can league themselves against us.

A third evil, however, we cannot escape, and in fact it has already befallen us. The journalist world, unoccupied either by parliamentary news at home or revolutionary news from abroad, has welcomed the tidings of the Catholic hierarchy with characteristic animation, and the columns of periodicals of every class have overflowed with its unmeasured taunts and vituperations. Never since the passing of the Emancipation Act have Catholics and the Pope been honoured with so large a share of anonymous but very genuine indignation; and we may safely assume that the newspaper anger has been but the reflection of the astonishment and terror-stricken irritation with which the recent act of his Holiness has been received by the "religious" public at large. It is undeniable that Protestants are far more angry with us than they were a few months ago; and we may anticipate a proportionate embitterment in their tone of controversy, and the alienation of some few of those

who have hitherto condescended to patronise us as a persecuted and innocent race.

Is all this, however, an evil, in any practical sense of the word? In other words, what harm does it do, either to ourselves or to Protestants? We confess that so far from thinking it an evil of any moment, we regard it as a blessing. *Catholics*, certainly, are not hurt by it. On the contrary, it instructs and amuses us. From the heavy artillery of the *Times* to the crackling of the jokes of *Punch*, the hubbub of all these Antiromish explosions furnishes us with a very agreeable entertainment, and diversifies the routine of our daily life. "Let those laugh who win," says the proverb. We can well afford a smile at the gibes of the joker, when they betoken the formidable victory which our religion is gradually winning over its enemies. And as to the more serious attacks so liberally bestowed, we can most honestly assure our Protestant readers that we look for very important advantages to Catholicism from them. The more the public is forced to hear of us and of our works, the better. Whether they read praises or slanders, it matters little. The result is much the same; men are brought to inquire into the real facts, and inquiry inevitably leads to conversions. The one grand difficulty we have to contend with is, the stupidity with which Protestants rest contented in their ignorance of ourselves and our creed. Puffed up with an insular satisfaction in their own infallibility and omniscience, they are the dupe of their own ignorance, and rest contented to believe nonsense the most incredible respecting a Church to which their own Establishment is as a mushroom to an oak of the forest. All we desire is, that they should see and know the Catholic Church as she is, and as she has ever been. When a child is frightened by an ugly vision of its own imagination, its nurse entreats the little one to stretch forth its hands and touch the empty phantom, that it may feel that it is terrified at what is no more than a dream; and thus we beg the simple public to touch us, to look us full in the face, to listen to our words, to inquire for itself, to use its waking faculties, confident that the goblin at which it has stood affrighted for some three centuries past, will vanish before its returning sense, and England will perceive that she has been raging at a bugbear.

It is therefore with the greatest satisfaction that we have for some time noted the increasing prominence which Catholic affairs have assumed in the discussions in public journals. Ten years ago there was not a tenth part of the space devoted to the proceedings of the Pope and of Catholics in general

which is now allotted to them. From the moment of the accession of Pius IX., the affairs of the Papacy have assumed an importance in the eyes of the English reading public, which still increases, rather than diminishes. Papal briefs are translated and published at length; anecdotes of the Pope are circulated and commented on; the acts and letters of the Irish Episcopate are served up as among the most piquant pieces of intelligence which an editor can supply; the proceedings of English Catholic Bishops interest the *quidnuncs* more than even sallies from Exeter or cautious proprieties from Lambeth; and the world is carefully informed of the movements of Cardinal Wiseman, while it rests in well-pleased ignorance of the comings and goings of the two Archbishops and five-and-twenty Bishops of the whole Anglican Establishment.

All this is a sign, if of nothing else, at least of the growing importance of the Catholic Church in these realms. If it is not a sign of favour, it is a mark of interest; if it is not a token of love, it is a symptom of fear. It foretels the day when we shall be heard, not merely in our own defence, but in our proclamations of the Divine message which the Church bears from Almighty God to the inhabitants of this empire. The numbers, power, and intelligence of the Catholic Church in England are already "a great fact." No statesman can despise it, no philosopher can ignore it, no Christian can forget it. And this is just what we desire. We seek only to come in contact with Protestantism, asking no favour, but only a clear stage for the conflict. We have that confidence in the justice and honourableness of our countrymen, which assures us that the inevitable consequence of this discussion of our acts and claims will be the ever-multiplying conversions of men of all ranks and dispositions. So it has ever been, and so it will be again.

It is most singular to note how many past conversions have originated in the fierceness of some attack on our religion. One person hears Dr. Cumming preach, another reads Dr. Pusey's books, a third is told that the *Garden of the Soul* has been held up to indignation in the House of Commons, a fourth is struck with horror at garbled extracts from the writings of St. Alphonsus Liguori, a fifth attends a series of Anticatholic controversial lectures, a sixth shudders over the Jesuit atrocities depicted in a strongly Protestant novel; but whatever be the first cause of interest, the end is the same. The astonished reader or hearer buys Catholic books, converses with Catholic men and women, visits Catholic churches, inquires into the facts of past and present history,

and either very considerably modifies his former prepossessions, or submits to the Catholic Church.*

If such, then, be the infinitesimally small amount of the loss which Catholics expect from the establishment of the hierarchy, what is our gain? We need have no hesitation in admitting that it will be far less than the exaggerated fears of our opponents have conceived. Its *immediate* advantage, indeed, is little enough, if advantage be measured by the amount of influence it will exert in the conversion of Protestants, and the purely spiritual condition of the Church within herself. Undoubtedly it will *lead* to great results, because it is the laying of the foundation-stone of a vast and magnificent building. But the most superb of palaces is not fit for use when its foundations are laid, or even when all its walls and roof are complete. The establishment of the hierarchy, so far as it is at present established, is but the first portion, though the most important one, of the entire parochial system with which the Church administers her affairs. When it can be thoroughly carried out, no human eye can foresee. Still more must we wait for time to bring about those secondary results which we yet anticipate from its operation, in the practical organising of the whole English Catholic body in all those multitudinous details by which we hope to accomplish our work in the land. As paving the way to an immense increase in our number of clergy, to the improvement of the education of rich and poor, to the multiplication of religious orders, to the building of schools and churches, to the more systematic administration of funds, to the organised employment of lay zeal and ability

* Two amusing instances of the benefit of violent attacks on Catholicism took place quite recently at Clifton. A short series of controversial lectures was preached in the church of the Holy Apostles in that place by a Catholic priest visiting in the neighbourhood. The first two lectures attracted no particular notice; but before the delivery of the third, there appeared in a Bristol newspaper a flaming article denouncing the preacher as "*a beardless David come to assault the Goliath of Protestantism,*" and calling upon all Protestants to treat the insult with becoming indignation. The result was, that the rest of the lectures were crowded with well-conducted Protestants, and that the church has been attended by numerous strangers ever since.

In the chapel of the Convent adjoining the same church a French sermon has been for some time past preached every afternoon. Shortly after the above-mentioned lectures, another article appeared in the same Bristol newspaper, loudly proclaiming that it was a scandal that the young men of Bristol made a practice of going to hear these sermons in order to acquire a knowledge of the French language, while so many Protestant teachers of French were unable to gain a decent living. All this was, in truth, a delusion of the writer, for the youth of Bristol were guiltless of the charge; but from the week that the article appeared, they thronged to hear the sermons denounced, and so have since continued to do.

in the service of religion, to the preaching of the gospel to the myriads lost in sin and ignorance in our populous cities, and to the general strengthening and edifying of the Church in this country, the establishment of the hierarchy is indeed pregnant with importance. But as to the dread which Protestants feel of some instant formidable effects upon them, their creed, and their possessions, the whole expectations are visionary. The erection of thirteen Catholic sees, with the residence of a Cardinal Archbishop in London, tends most powerfully to give stability to all our present advantages, and to secure the acquisition of many more. But it does not operate like a charm, or cause every Catholic to wake up the next morning a different being from that which he was when he lay down to sleep, while the letters from Rome yet slumbered undelivered in the heretical post-office. We regard the new state of things with joy and gratitude, not as indicative of some spiritual revolution, but as the natural result of that progress with which Almighty God has already blessed us, and as an aid to the fulfilment of those tremendous responsibilities which the increase of our Catholic population has entailed. To his Holiness Pius the Ninth we offer a fresh homage of individual and national gratitude, in addition to that affectionate veneration with which the whole Church regards a Pontiff in whom the mingled sufferings and triumphs of the Apostles are so strikingly renewed, and in whose personal character a charm is found which wins its way to the heart of every person who is admitted into his presence. And to Almighty God, who is the author of all good to us, we render redoubled thanks, that He has mercifully placed us in his Church to do our duty at a period so singularly blest as the present, when the bitterness of ancient persecutions is passed, and the temptations of wealth and earthly power are not around us; when all we have to fear are the empty words of our enemies, and the snares which beset us as inheritors of natural human frailty; when the laws of the land do not make loyalty to the temporal power almost incompatible with loyalty to our Master in heaven; when there is just sufficient persecuting feeling remaining to serve as a test of our sincerity and a trial to our courage; when, in a word, our chief foes are those which grace and faith can conquer, because they reside in our own breasts.

And it is precisely because this is our present state, that we indulge in such glorious anticipations of the coming triumphs of the Church in this country of England. It is because we know *how* the Catholic Church ever conquers, that we already catch the strains of the song of victory borne upon the gales of a bright futurity. Riches are *not* the sources of

the strength of Catholicism, while they are the sources of the power of Protestantism. Mark well the history of Catholicism, and contrast it with the circumstances of Anglicanism, and every other form of established heresy. The moment any branch of the Catholic Church, or any religious order, has become excessively wealthy, that moment it has begun to lose its power over the people, and to lay itself bare to the blows of the destroyer. The records of the Church for the last three centuries unfold a long catalogue of attacks upon her by men tempted by her vast possessions, and unimpressed with any belief in her apostolic love of poverty and austerities. And still the assault continues, and we believe that it will continue until the Church *every where* is robbed of all but the most limited earthly treasures. Then turn to that giant institution which lies heavy upon the heart of England, the established Anglican communion. It stands *by means of* its enormous riches. Rob it of its tithes and glebes and fees, eject its clergy from cathedral and parish church and parsonage, and it would drop instantly into the most insignificant of Protestant sects. It has no spiritual vitality or energy. Impoverish it, and it is gone. Conceive the fifteen thousand Anglican clergy reduced to the same pecuniary position as the eight hundred Catholic clergy. What would Dr. Sumner be without Lambeth Palace and the income of a duke? what the learning of Oxford and Cambridge without their fellowships and venerable cloisters? They not only thrive and flourish, but they all *exist* upon silver and gold. The wealth which corrupts the children of the true Church, and destroys their power among men, is the very origin of the life and energy of those who ape her character and usurp her functions. God has sent forth his Church into the world to win her way, not with earthly possessions, but by faith, by the power of his grace, by austerities, by poverty, by sufferings, by the shedding of her own blood. When she is offered gold and jewels and fine raiment, she frequently can with difficulty refuse them; she is often bound to accept them, and to employ them to the glory of God. But gold is a temptation even to the Christian; the large endowments which the apostolic poverty of the clergy of one age elicits from the piety of the wealthy, become the subtlest of snares to another age, when poverty is forgotten and piety has grown cold. All history tells the same sad tale. Catholics who have surmounted every other obstacle have fallen beneath the enervating influence of their own possessions. An age of poverty won England to the faith, an age of riches lost it. Strange, mysterious, and awful destiny! Yet is it but the carrying forward the mystery of the

redemption of mankind. Anglicanism, with its millions of revenue, will fall the moment those millions are departed; Catholicism is advancing from victory to victory at the time that her poverty is more severe than at any period before.

No! little do our Protestant adversaries understand our aims, if they imagine that it is to any *temporal* strength in our new hierarchy that we look as the source of its coming power. Little do they comprehend the reality and might of that spiritual dominion which God has given to the rulers of his Church, even though the ancient shrines of Westminster and York are still grasped by the hands of usurping rebellion. Little do they enter into our aspirations, if they imagine that they are bounded by visions of clouds of incense, and minstrel choirs, and gold-clad ecclesiastics, and jewelled crosiers, and galaxies of light, betokening in the desecrated cathedrals of England the triumph of the old faith, and its restoration to earthly power and luxury. Joyous, indeed, would be the day when such a sight should gladden the eyes of London as the ministrations of a Catholic Cardinal, surrounded by all the glory and pomp which earth could offer, beneath the roof of the glorious old abbey of Westminster. But if such visions ever cross our thoughts in day-dreams of coming change, let the Protestant rest assured that they do but flit across our thoughts as bare possibilities, and as of incomparably less moment than the conversion of the millions of our countrymen to that faith which, with all the splendour with which at times it is adorned, is the religion of *the cross* after all. The temples we first seek to recover are the souls of men; those souls whose wretchedness and sin no hand save that of the true Church can heal, and who are daily gathering in fresh multitudes in the hidden recesses of our towns and the broad expanse of our fields. There we seek to do our duty; there is our battlefield; and whether or no we remain in our poverty, there will be our triumph. And it is because our aim is such as this, and not because we aspire to sit in kings' courts, or to revel in those treasures which once were ours, that we rejoice in this Christianising of our country once more, and look forward to the completion of that edifice of which the deep foundations have just been laid.

RELIGION AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

No. IV.

THE RELIGION OF THE MODERN PHILOSOPHER.

ACCORDING to the interpretation of Genesis which we have ventured to suggest, and which, as we have shewn, contains nothing contrary to ecclesiastical authority, the objections urged by unbelievers against the Mosaic system, and the traditional teaching of the Church, as being committed to a narrow childish view of the natural universe, disappear. The system of Moses appears to be limitless, both with regard to time and space. Its proportions grow with the enlargement of science. It paints in a few words the original chaotic vaporous state of the whole material universe, and the agglomeration of systems and worlds out of the condensing fluids by the universal action of light and motion. And not only is it thus universal in space, but in time also it fixes no limit, no historical beginning to the creative agency. Its days do not represent to us epochs of time, but the gradual dawning of morning over evening—the almost imperceptible, but steady and irresistible, march of order, gaining the ground of the old chaotic confusion. How long time this took, the inspired writer does not tell us; he leaves it to our imagination to suggest a duration worthy of the patience of an eternal God, to whom all imaginable time is but as a moment, and who can wait millions of millions of years for the accomplishment of the least of his designs.

Whatever be the sense in which the earth on which we live is to be regarded as the centre of the universe, the agencies described by Moses may be regarded as universal, though he speaks of them more particularly in relation to our earth; and this was necessary. If his history is intended to be a *sign* of his inspiration, the sign must be given in objects which are within the range of our observation. It would be useless to speak of the vegetables of the planet Mars, or the animal kingdom of Jupiter. In all scientific works, it is necessary that the largest space should be devoted to terrestrial phenomena; so it is in Humboldt's *Cosmos*—and the apology which the modern philosopher makes for himself is equally applicable to the case of Moses. He says: "If, notwithstanding the smallness of our planet, the most considerable space and the most attentive consideration be

here afforded to that which exclusively concerns it, this arises solely from the disproportion in the extent of our knowledge of that which is accessible and of that which is closed to our observation."* Moses does not make the earth the centre of the universe in any other sense than modern science makes it so, namely, as the centre of observation. Neither did the Jewish writers, who may be supposed to teach the traditional doctrine of Moses, give the slightest ground for such an imputation. David, for instance, contrasts the insignificance of man with the immensity and beauty of the universe in terms which he could never have used if he had supposed that man was enthroned as the centre of the world. When he beheld "the heavens, the work of God's fingers, the moon and the stars which He had founded,"† he was not moved to utter a rhapsody on the sublimity of man, or "the high destiny of his race, which is permitted to comprehend nature, and to lift the veil which shrouds her phenomena;"‡ but he was led to exclaim, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him! or the son of man, that Thou visitest him!" Both Jews and Christians have always believed that the universe is peopled with beings far more powerful and glorious than man; whereas the tendency of modern philosophy is to ignore the existence of any intelligent power higher than itself, and is, therefore, much more open to the charge of unduly exalting man than revealed religion can be. And the dogma of the Incarnation, against which such a charge is brought by infidels, is, in reality, the furthest removed from it, teaching, as it does, that it was not a glorious and radiant nature, but our fallen and degraded humanity that God took upon Him. Christianity is not the proud apotheosis of humanity, but the humiliation of the Deity; its inmost essence is humility; pride is its great antagonist; "he that exalts himself shall be brought low" is the very centre of its moral system; the humiliation of the eternal Son of God is its dogmatic foundation. If philosophers imagine that they see any thing in Christianity which looks like an undue exaltation of human nature, they are the very last persons in the world who ought to reproach us with it. They themselves, as Humboldt owns, introduced this way of speaking. It was, he says, in the period of Alexander's campaigns that the richness of nature "no longer sufficed to engage exclusive attention, for the time was come when man, and the different races of mankind, could not fail to be regarded, according to Aristotle's own expression, as the central point and object of all creation, and as the beings in whom the divine nature of

* *Cosmos*, p. 48.† *Ps.* viii.‡ *Cosmos*, p. 3.

thought was first made manifest.”* Aristotle, and not Christianity, enthroned man as the centre and object of creation, and the first and highest of intellectual beings. Thus did he lay the foundations of that antireligious school of the present day, which owns no objective truths, but tries all things by the standard of individual feelings and intentions; which uses the word *truth*, but means only *rectitude* and sincerity; which affirms, that if a man is sincere, it does not matter what he believes; and which will even go so far as to maintain, with Mr. Loudon, the unintelligible proposition, that “if a man believe that Rome is paved with cinders, to him it is true; and if a whole people believe with Pythagoras that the earth is an immense plain, to them that system is as true as the Copernican system is to us. The same thing holds as to religion, and each species or variety is true to those who believe in it.” The modern philosopher has returned to the system of Protagoras, that all knowledge is sensation, and that the individual man is the measure of all existing things whatever. It is only Christianity that measures all things by an external standard. With us, Christ is the model for imitation, and the measure whereby all men are to be judged.

“But, after all,” it may be said, “the doctrine of the Incarnation, though accidentally humbling to the pride of the individual, really exalts the human race, as summed up and represented in Christ; and makes his birth-place, and the scene of his actions, the points of the greatest importance, at least morally, in the whole universe. Now one would think, that in the fitness of things (and Christians build much on the argument of theological fitness), a place of such importance in the Divine counsels as our Earth is represented to be would be recognisable by some outward mark, which should distinguish it from all other orbs that circulate in the regions of space. Yet the physical sciences shew us no such characteristic. There are thousands of orbs brighter and more glorious than the earth; our planet has no prerogative over others. It is quite an insignificant speck in the universe.”

Yes, it is so; and in comparison with the whole, what cosmical body is not such a speck? The regions of space are immeasurable; each cosmical body of the numberless myriads which circulate therein is limited in its extent. Whatever body among them might be chosen as the seat of the moral centre of the universe would be equally unworthy of its high destiny; it would be like the earth, an insignificant speck. “Still,” it will be objected, “it might be some central body, with a system dependent upon it, a self-luminous body, that in

* *Cosmos*, p. 530.

mass and volume transcended other orbs." Yet surely there is no reason why it should appear to us fitting that the orb of the greatest physical importance should be chosen as the seat of the highest moral and intelligent life, the scene of the humiliation of God. The tallest and strongest man need not be the wisest and best. If the Creator ought to have been incarnate on the most glorious orb, He should, by the same rule, have appeared with all possible created glory; born not in a stable, but in a palace; clothed in rich garments, gold, and jewels, not swathed in rags; served by kings and courtiers, instead of serving a poor carpenter. If He had come thus, we might have justly said, "Why did He not choose some brighter world as the scene of his glory?" But He came in humiliation, and He chose, perhaps, the vilest and most degraded place for the scene of his life and labours, as He chose the lowest of intelligent natures to be eternally united to his own. Even in the material universe the centres of all the physical agencies are not coincident. The magnetic poles of the earth do not coincide with its mechanical poles, nor is the centre of gravity of our whole system identical with the centre of the sun. And it is the boast of an author* of our own days, and his admirers, that he was the first to discover the axiom, that the physical, organic, and moral laws operate independently of each other, though he does not seem to have thought of applying his axiom except to cases of reward and punishment. "An individual who neglects, or carelessly observes, the corresponding physical law will be drowned, or burnt, or crushed, and that invariably, however strictly he may obey the moral laws. Again, if he obey the organic laws, he will reap bodily health, which is the specific reward of that obedience; nor will any degree of moral turpitude, if he avoids sensual excess, materially diminish his health. But his moral defects will bring their own punishment, and from this his health of body will not protect him." Now granting the truth of this axiom in the main, we cannot admit that it is applicable only to the system of rewards and punishments. If these laws are independent in their action, why not also in their essence and root? If they are thus independent, why complain because the moral centre is not also the physical centre of the universe? because the manifestation of moral perfection is not surrounded by the brightest halo of sensible magnificence? because moral changes are not also manifested in organic and physical changes? because, when a man has committed a crime, he bears no outward marks of guilt, and when a Church is hopelessly involved in

* George Combe.

schism and heresy, no voices are heard in her temples proclaiming, "Let us go hence?"

It is because the very existence of religion is ignored, or if admitted at all, it is considered only as a curious branch of history or of mental philosophy, a mere separable limb of the whole body of knowledge, which may be cultivated or neglected, according to the taste and fancy of the student. It is thought also to be a branch of so small importance, and so little worthy of the attention of practical and scientific men, that although in matters of politics, trade, or science, they insist that all inquiries should be conducted with the greatest accuracy and caution, and that all care should be taken to avoid the illusion of the senses, and the *idola tribus, specus, fori et theatri*, which Bacon warns them against; yet in religion they content themselves with the vaguest guesses and the crudest theories; they acquiesce without examination in the opinion, that the sect of Protestantism in which they happen to have been educated is the true representative of Christianity; and immediately they find facts repugnant to their views, rather than use the same patience and caution in correcting them which they willingly use in scientific inquiries, they give up religion altogether as untenable and unphilosophical, or if they preserve some attachment to it, it is only as a matter of *feeling*, not of reason.*

This seems to be the case with the otherwise profound author of the *Cosmos*. He is pre-eminently a lover of reason, and therefore he is always striving to perfect his scientific knowledge. Religion is only a matter of feeling to him, and therefore he has been contented with the crude ideas of the Mosaic cosmogony which an ignorant age had invented, and which he had probably been taught in his childhood. When science opened before him, his acute mind saw at once the inconsistency, and impatient to put off the trammels of the irrational form of Christianity which alone he knew, he exaggerated it into an "eternal contest between knowledge and faith."† He chose his side. He determined to let no traditional dogmas stand in the way of the development of his theories; and thus he "met unappalled the threatening impediments which even in modern times present themselves at the en-

* Professor Baden Powell complains that "there is no subject on which the generality even of educated and reasoning persons are less given to reason than on religion. The prevalent disposition is to avoid all examination of religious matters; to adopt nominally the established creed without question; to dismiss all particular distinctions from the thoughts, &c.; and all this grounded upon and vindicated by the favourite and fashionable idea, that religion is altogether a matter of feeling."—*Tradition Unveiled*, p. 62.

† *Cosmos*, p. 616.

trance of certain departments of science,"* and proclaimed the advent of the most glorious epoch of modern geognosy, when it was emancipated from the sway of scientific doctrines;† by which he meant, not merely that the Genesis of Moses was never meant to supersede science, that science was by no means obliged to bow to arbitrary interpretations of that document, with whatever shew of authority they might present themselves, but he meant, as he elsewhere expresses himself, that he only recognised the account of the creation as a "myth,"‡ and the Christian religion, in its historical form, as a "despondent mysticism,"§ and a "fanaticism."|| This being his opinion, it is not surprising that he can find no other motive but "party spirit" to account for the earnest strife of Catholics to preserve the traditionary faith; thus, he talks of "dogmatic dissensions awakened by party spirit—a dreary contest of knowledge and faith."¶ He talks of the Nestorian school at Edessa being "dissolved by Christian fanaticism."** Yet still, with many exceptions and drawbacks, he gives it a faint modicum of praise, as "having materially contributed to call forth the idea of the unity of the human race, and having thus tended to exercise a favourable influence on the *humanisation* of nations in their morals, manners, and institutions;"†† but in the next page he speaks of "the mild and long-enduring but slowly operating influence which it exercised," as if this influence was now only to be spoken of in the past tense, as if Christianity was a phase which humanity has passed through, and which has now given place to Socialism, or some new and more universal religion adapted to the spirit of the age. Of course, it will not surprise us, after this, to find him classing Christianity with Buddhism, or other phases in which the religious feeling of mankind has at different times exhibited itself, and even with merely civil events, as the predominance of certain languages. "The predominance of certain languages," he says, "has operated favourably, like Christianity and Buddhism, in bringing together and uniting mankind."‡‡ This comparison seems to be a favourite one with our author. He classes together Christian anchorites and "Buddhist monks,"§§ and calls their Lamas|||| archbishops. And then at last, lest any admirer might have room to say that all these apparently irreverent classifications are allowable to a philosopher, who, by his profession, is obliged to generalise and classify, he tells us what he thinks of Christian doctrine. "*Christian views*," he says, owe their

* Cosmos, p. 616.	† Ib. p. 272.	‡ Ib. p. 395.	§ Ib. p. 418.
Ib. p. 469.	¶ Ib. p. 552.	** Ib. p. 579.	†† Ib. p. 567.
‡‡ Ib. p. 471.	§§ Ib. p. 608.	Ib. p. 572, note.	

origin to "*Platonic dogmas*;"* and now "survive only in the superstitions of the people and the prejudices of the ignorant, or are perpetuated in a few systems, which, conscious of their weakness, shroud themselves in a veil of mystery."†

Having thus, with perfect satisfaction to himself, completed that which Dr. Johnson somewhat problematically calls the most painful part of a philosopher's duty, namely, the demolition of the labours of all who have preceded him, our author proceeds to his work of edification. For although the plan of his work excludes any regular discussion of religious matters, yet he has found room for a few remarks, which are abundantly sufficient to indicate what religion it is that he would establish on the ruins of Christianity. And here it is both amusing and instructive to mark how, with all his sneers at tradition and the infancy of human knowledge, he nevertheless strives to found his opinions on a traditional base. By reflection, he says, "we become more and more convinced of the truth of the *ancient doctrine*, that the forces inherent in matter, and those which govern the moral world, exercise their action under the control of primordial necessity, and in accordance with movements occurring periodically after longer or shorter intervals. It is this necessity," he continues, "this occult but permanent connexion, this periodical recurrence in the progressive development of forms, phenomena, and events, which constitutes *nature*."‡ And a few pages farther on we are told a little more about this *nature*. "Nature, as Schelling remarks, is not an inert mass; and to him who can comprehend her vast sublimity, she reveals herself as *the creative force of the universe; before all time, eternal, ever active, she calls to life all things, whether perishable or imperishable*."§ And of what kind are these material and moral forces? He only tells us what he believes them not to be—imponderable substances and vital forces are merely mythical ideas.|| And a person who makes so absurd a remark as to say that a soul although incorporeal yet is *something*, is only worthy to be answered by having attention called to his proposition; such seems to be the idea insinuated by the note of admiration intercalated in a passage quoted from Vossius: "*Lux, sonus, anima (!), odor, vis magnetica, quamvis incorporea, sunt tamen aliquid*."¶ That is, we suppose, the soul is either corporeal, or it is nothing. The idea of spirit has nothing to represent it in the world of reality. God, if He exists at all, is not to be distinguished from the material universe. As man, by his organ of wonder, has, in the infancy of his knowledge, been

* Cosmos, p. 615.
§ Ib. p. 36.

† Ib. p. 2.
|| Ib. p. 58.

‡ Ib. p. 30.
¶ Ib. p. 717, note.

impelled to people all the unexplored recesses of earth, sea, and air with imaginary beings, nymphs, satyrs, fairies, hobgoblins, and ghosts; and to attribute supernatural powers to natural agents, as witches and magicians; all which superstitions have been gradually but effectually cleared away by the purifying agency of ever-advancing science; so also has the same organ of wonder, the structural necessity of the brain, compelled man to people the shining orbs of the sky with angels and saints, and with a definitely located and humanised Providence, in a word, with a Christ. But these also, like their humbler companions, the fairies and goblins of the earth, are destined to fall before the ruthless march of intellect. Telescopes will be directed into all regions of space; every thing seen there, all substance therein, will be noted down and catalogued; but in these scientific catalogues there will never appear the name of God. No! as science advances, it will sweep away God from heaven, as it has swept away fairies and goblins from the earth. A hundred years hence all theologies will be held in the same estimation as witchcraft and astrology are held by the learned of the present day.

From this we may see what our modern philosophers mean by religion. According to them, in the early ages of our race, religion was the activity of the organ of wonder, peopling with its own mysterious creations all the regions of space, and the whole world of matter, which were beyond the circle of experimental knowledge. It was a surrendering of the whole man to the feelings, at one time dark and terrible, at another light and glad, which the ideas of these imaginary beings awakened. Its worship was merely the expression of these feelings, of love and hatred, hope and fear; and its highest outpouring was a kind of dogmatic hymn of triumph, recounting the actions and nature of the deity to be honoured, and expressive, not only of faith, but also of stern defiance to all who might impugn the truth and reality of the dogmas. The feelings, without this base of faith and dogma, would have been inconstant and pulpy, like a jelly-fish, or any of those boneless animals which constitute the lowest class of vital beings. And the highest, most manly, and most triumphant expression of the feelings thus strengthened would be an Athanasian Creed, half hymn, half symbol. But in modern times science has extended itself over all space: at least, so much is known, that common sense revolts at the idea that what is unknown can break the unity and analogy of that which has been already discovered. Knowledge, moreover, has stretched itself out to such a distance in space, that imagination itself can scarcely transcend the boundaries, and form

in the regions beyond a receptacle for its own creations. The former use of the organ of wonder is rendered impossible, and religion itself is obliged to change its character. It is no longer a surrendering of the faith to the fancy, and of the feelings to the influence of the unreal phantoms of the imagination; but it is simply the enjoyment awakened in us by the aspect of nature, and the feelings aroused by the action of the laws of matter on the affinities of our material frame. "Every where," says Humboldt, "the mind is penetrated by the same sense of the grandeur and vast expanse of nature, revealing to the soul, by a mysterious inspiration, the existence of laws that regulate the forces of the universe. Mere communion with nature, mere contact with the free air, exercise a soothing yet strengthening influence on the wearied spirit, calm the storm of passion, and soften the heart when shaken to its inmost depths. Every where, in every region of the globe, in every stage of intellectual culture, the same sources of enjoyment are alike vouchsafed to man."* Then he talks of "the earnest and solemn thoughts awakened by a communion with nature." In this point of view, religion is simply a branch of amusement, necessary for the sanitary condition of the mind of the masses, as baths and wash-houses, parks and cricket-grounds, are to their bodily health. The philosopher, or statesman, or merchant, or physician, may fearlessly neglect it, and thereby gain time and leisure to apply to more useful and more practical branches of study. Such is the separation between religion and life in its furthest development.

And this new religion must be dressed according to its station in the world. What is a religion without its prayers, its hymns, and its creeds, without its intellectual basis, and its symbolic books? What is Christianity without its dogmas, its worship, and its Bible; Islamism without its Koran, Hindooism without its Vedas, and Buddhism without its kings? Humboldt's *Cosmos* appears to be an attempt to supply this want for the new religion. It is sustained throughout with a kind of sacerdotal grandeur. The very form of it answers to the wants of the religion as we have described it. First he gives us his reflections on the different degrees of enjoyment presented to us by the aspect of Nature and the study of her laws, in the course of which he notices the gradual change from the worship and deification of the forces of the universe to the present scientific mode of inquiry.† Next he defines the precise limits of his science. Then he comes to his delineation of Nature, his great dogmatic hymn, in which his object is "to describe the universal all (τὸ πᾶν) in a

* *Cosmos*, p. 3.† *Ib.* p. 16, &c.

manner worthy of the dignity of the word *Cosmos*, in its signification of *universe, order of the world, and adornment of this universal order*;"* and which, like a Vates of old, he introduces with an invocation: "May the immeasurable diversity of phenomena which crowd into the picture of nature in no way detract from that harmonious impression of rest and unity which is the ultimate object of every literary or purely artistical composition!"† After this he devotes a section to "the influence of the external world on the imagination and feelings;" and lastly, he gives us "the history of the contemplation of Nature, or the progressive development of the idea of the Cosmos." Such is this book of the "Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms," of this new religion, which we take leave to call a sentimental materialism.

We hope on some future occasion to have an opportunity for discussing the intellectual basis of this religion; at present we must content ourselves with observing, that in the case of Humboldt's *Cosmos* its basis is pure assumption. It no more follows from his premises than the doctrine of the Trinity. He may catalogue as many facts as he pleases, and reduce them all to his two great forms of philosophic abstraction, quantitative and qualitative;‡ but still he has obtained nothing but the number, magnitude, and specific differences of phenomena. He has nothing but a classified inventory of the contents of the universe. He has not advanced one step nearer to the great questions, What is it? and How did it come to be? "No power of genius," says Emerson, "has yet had the smallest success in explaining existence—the perfect enigma remains." "The human mind," says George Combe, "is incapable of penetrating to a knowledge of the substance or essence of any being or thing in the universe. All that it can discover are qualities and modes of action." Why, then, does Humboldt, after dazzling us with his gigantic powers of abstraction and of induction, after displaying before our astonished view the extent of his all-comprehensive glance, and after assuring us§ that he will carefully avoid exceeding the limits of a rational empiricism, that is, of the results of facts registered by science, and tested by the operations of intellect,—by a trick of jugglery suddenly carry us beyond the regions of phenomena, and ask us, as the result of his induction, to confess with him that there is no God but Nature, the creative force of the universe, before all time, eternal? Either he knew that his argument was illogical, and then he is dishonest; or he did not know it, and then he is not to be trusted as a reasoner.

* *Cosmos*, p. 62.

† *Ib.*

‡ *Ib.* p. 57.

§ *Ib.* p. 30.

But if our minds cannot penetrate the substance of things, what becomes of dogmatic theology? If dogmatic theology was simply the result of our intellectual activity, it would not be worth a moment's consideration. But it comes to us as revelation. Moses comes before us, and says, "I tell you of things which no power of intellect can ever discover, but which are necessary for the spiritual good of man. And in proof that I am commissioned by a higher power, I work miracles before the eyes of my contemporaries; and I leave as a legacy to distant generations this book, containing an account of the formation of the world, and the succession of the causes which produced it, which shall be only verified by the very latest discoveries of science. I have not chosen past events, the evidence of which will have disappeared, in order to shew my knowledge; but I have chosen the revolutions of nature, which leave their evidence behind them, buried in the depths of the earth and sky, only to be revealed to the last ages of science. Man leaves his footstep on the sand, to be washed out by the next tide; an organised world is destroyed, but it leaves its indestructible evidence as fossils in the rock. Here, then, will I choose my subject, where I shall be constantly exposed to conviction if I utter a false word; but, on the other hand, if I speak truly, you must either own that I was a superior being to you, when, without instruments, I could discover the secrets of the earth and sky, which to common human intelligence are only revealed after ages of laborious investigation and induction; for which reason I may surely ask for credit when I tell you about God and the soul of man; or else you must own that I spoke not my own words, but the words of God revealing Himself to you by me, in which case you must adore and believe." Such is the evidence on which we dogmatise concerning substance; and Humboldt, who sneers at our conclusion, is one of the very strongest witnesses of our facts. Almighty God knows how to make his very enemies glorify Him: He forges the weapons of his Church from the swords of her assailants.

COLLECTIONS ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF THE
ENGLISH BENEDICTINE CONGREGATION.

Dedication.

TO THE VERY REV. LUKE BARBER, D.D.

President of the English Congregation O.S.B.

DEAR AND VERY REV. FATHER,—I hasten to offer you the fruits of my humble researches. Since I could first think for myself, I conceived a lively sense of affectionate gratitude towards your venerable order, the eldest daughter of the Catholic Church; and I must believe that all true English Catholics share in this feeling. Her disinterested zeal for souls, her moderation and conciliatory spirit in directing them to God,* her love of his solemn worship, her encouragement of literature and the polite arts, her patronage of agricultural improvement, but especially her noble charity to the poor and unprotected, must be admitted and admired by all. Marked for destruction with the younger plantations that issued from her as the parent stock, in an evil hour that ruthless despot Henry VIII. cut down the stately tree. The root, however, remained, and shot forth again in the reign of Queen Mary. But her sacrilegious sister Elizabeth, dreading the prospect of religious stability presented by the restoration of Westminster Abbey, once more felled down Monachism. Notwithstanding her malice, life remained, shoots were transplanted into foreign climes, and carefully propagated; and the good old spirit revived and flourished.

This blessed, not to say miraculous preservation, I have attempted to shew to my readers. Accept my cordial wishes for the increasing prosperity of the English Benedictine Congregation, over which you so worthily preside. In giving utterance to them, I may be permitted to adopt the words of the pious and learned authors of the *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia*, part ii. p. 222: “Inter cetera Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ decora, Ordinem S. Benedicti conservare dignetur et illuminare Deus O.M., ut etiam hac ætate, inter fortissimos sanctissimosque fidei prædicatores, suo in loco et gradu, caste, integre, mansuete inculpateque, ad multarum animarum salutem æternam laboret.” Amen. O.

* Venerable Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* lib. i. cap. xxvi.) records how King Ethelbert, whilst encouraging the conversion of his subjects, compelled none to embrace Christianity; for he had learnt from his instructors and leaders to salvation that the service of Christ ought to be voluntary, and not by coercion.

Preamble.

After the expulsion of the monks from Westminster Abbey on the memorable 12th July, 1559, by the heartless Queen Elizabeth, and her commitment of the venerable and learned abbot John Feckenham to a prison, whence death released him twenty-six years later, the youth of our country whom God inspired with a vocation to embrace the rule of St. Benedict had to solicit admission into the *foreign* monasteries of the order. The abbey of St. Justina at Padua, of the congregation of Monte Cassino, of St. Bennet's at Valladolid, and of St. Martin's at Compostella, were the principal ones to afford them this resource and asylum. In England, the want of missionaries beginning to be severely felt, the superiors of these young men consented that some of these monks, now promoted to priesthood, should engage, under their respective obedience, in that perilous but meritorious service. FF. Robert (Gregory) Sayer,* Anselm Beech of Manchester, and Thomas Preston, were ordered by their Italian superiors to prepare themselves for the expedition; they were soon after to be joined by F. Austin White *alias* Bradshaw (of St. John), F. John Mervin *alias* Roberts, F. Maurus Scott, and others. Pope Clement VIII., on 5th October, 1603, expressly enjoined (as F. Weldon observes in his *Chronological Notes*, p. 29) the Archpriest George Blackwell, "not to think of extending his jurisdiction over them, but solely to watch over the priests who had been brought up in the seminaries."

Providentially there still survived in England one representative of the old Benedictine congregation, in the person of Dom Robert (Sigebert) Buckley. He had recently been discharged from captivity in Framlingham Castle by his new sovereign, James I. On 21st November, 1607, he received the profession of two of the late arrivals from the continent, viz. of F. Robert (Vincent) Sadler, and of F. Edward Mayhew; and on 15th December, 1609, he surrendered all his powers and authority for perpetuating the succession to F. Thomas Preston.† Like Simeon of old, this patriarch of his brethren was now content to resign his soul to his Creator; and on the 22d February following, aged ninety-three, paid the debt of nature. Bigotry denied him a resting-place in the pa-

* "This intended prime star or sun of the English-Italian Benedictine mission," as F. Weldon describes him, prematurely died at Venice, 30th October, 1602.

† See his beautiful Act of Transfer, p. 4 of the Appendix to the *Apostolatus*.

rochial cemetery; but his friends and attendants, FF. Thomas Preston and Anselm Beech, deposited his precious remains in the old chapel near Punisholt *alias* Ponshelt, the seat of the Norton family.

And now the experience of every day proved the expediency of reviving the ancient form and discipline of the English Benedictine government: the subsequent foundation of the houses of Douay, Dieulwart, and St. Malo's, rendered the union of increasing numbers under one head not only expedient but imperative; and Pope Paul V. was known to be highly favourable to such a re-organisation. *Fiat corpus, fiat congregatio* (*Apostolatus*, part ii. p. 210). Yet it required much time and labour, and the sacrifice of feelings, habits, and private interests, to accomplish this desirable end. His Holiness at last, on 19th May, 1616, expedited a brief, commanding *nine definitors* to be chosen *ex toto missionis gremio*, and out of the whole body of English Benedictines, without any respect of Italian, Spanish, or English congregations; that the *nine* were to be elected by the plurality of votes of all professed members, and that the definitors elect should be empowered to constitute and enact ordinances and rules, and to nominate officers and superiors.* At the scrutiny, the nine elect were found to be: F. Leander (of St. Martin) Jones, Vicar-General of the Spanish congregation; F. Robert (Vincent) Sadler, President of the English congregation; F. Gabriel (de S. Maria) Gifford, Prior of St. Malo's; F. Robert Haddock, Superior of the Spanish congregation in England; F. Ruderind Barlow, Prior of St. Gregory's College at Douay; F. Edward Mayhew, Prior of St. Lawrence's at Dieulwart; F. Bennet (à Santo Facundo) Jones *alias* William Price, assistant to the Vicar in England; Thomas Torquatus Latham, professor of philosophy at Douay; F. Sigebert Bagshaw, a monk of the English congregation, who had been procurator at Rome. (*Appendix*, p. 23.)

In virtue of the Nuncio's orders, the above nine assembled at Paris on 1st June, 1617, possessing the full power and force of a general chapter, and drew up a code of laws and constitutions to be submitted to his Holiness, and then nominated for the following officers: for *first president*, Rev. F. Gabriel Gifford; for *second elect president*, F. Leander (de St. Martino) Jones. Provincial of Canterbury, F. Gregory Grange; provincial of York, F. Vincent Sadler. Prior of Douay, F. Francis Antrobos; prior of Dieulwart, F. Jocelin Elmer; prior of St. Malo's, F. Paulinus Greenwood; prior at

* See the Decree in the Appendix, *ut supra*, p. 21.

Paris, F. Thos. Monnington. Procurator at Rome, F. Sigebert Bagshaw. Secretary to the President, F. Columban Malon.

Shortly after F. Gifford ("Primus Præses in eo definitorio renuntiatus"—*Apostolatus*, part ii. 198), the first president, was chosen by Louis de Guise, Archbishop of Rheims, for his coadjutor, and was consecrated Bishop on 17th Sept. 1618, by the title of *Episcopus Archidapollitanus*. His authority of president devolved on F. Leander, a man of distinguished merit, and most instrumental in persuading his brethren to sacrifice all private convenience and independence for a great public good; to seek not their own interests, but those of Jesus Christ.

With this preamble we may proceed on our course, premising that we avail ourselves of the *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia* and of F. Weldon's Chronological Notes very largely.

CHAPTER I.

St. Gregory's Convent at Douay.

F. AUSTIN WHITE (of St. John), *alias* BRADSHAW, in consequence of the increased persecution of Catholics after the discovery of the execrable Gunpowder Plot, withdrew from England to Douay. In his capacity of Vicar-General of the English Spanish Benedictine mission, he was anxious to secure a refuge for his subjects, and also to provide a nursery for the training of such as the Spirit of God should dispose to embrace the order. He commenced with taking a portion called the dormitory of the Marchien College in the town; but the quarters were found so inconveniently small, that at the end of a twelvemonth he removed to a tenement adjoining, which belonged to the Trinitarians. This situation was little better, for it was confined and obscure. Their distressful condition, at the recommendation of the Archduke Albert and Cardinal Montalt, was at length relieved by the venerable Philip de Cavarel, the lord abbot of St. Vedast in Arras. He generously gave an eligible site in Douay to erect "his Gregorian Convent and College" in 1608;* and by the blessing of Heaven the community was transferred into the new premises in 1611. The pious abbot added to his princely gift a country house and garden at Esquertin, about three miles from Douay, and

* The Abbé Mann, in his brief account of our British Catholic Establishments on the Continent, printed in the *Archæologia*, vol. xiii. p. 26, incorrectly states "early in 1605." The Abbé gave himself little trouble to search for the best evidence.

settled a full maintenance for twelve English monks, who should be bound to keep continual choir; stipulating also, that his abbey in Arras should remain charged with all repairs of the said convent and college; but that the premises should revert to the abbey when the Catholic religion should be restored in England.* Dying 1st December, 1636, æt. 84, the pious founder bequeathed to them his heart: *Cor meum jungatur vobis*. It was deposited on 19th of the same month and year under a brass plate before St. Gregory's high altar.

The first superior, before the union in June 1617, was the above-mentioned Austin Bradshaw. He was a native of Worcester; and as his epitaph at Longueville, near Dieppe, records, during the ten years of his superiority over the Spanish Benedictine mission in England, fitted out four martyrs and fifty confessors of the faith. He died on 4th May, 1618, æt. 42. He was succeeded by F. Nicholas Becket, whose government was short, as he proceeded to the mission, and died at Cank in Staffordshire on 30th October, 1618. F. Ruderind Barlow (of whom we shall have to treat more fully in the sequel) was filling the office of prior up to the time of holding the first chapter. Hitherto, it seems, from the *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia* (Appendix, p. 11, no. 3), that the Italian custom of holding triennial office† had prevailed. Indeed, Cardinal Pole, a great admirer of Italic observances, appointed Dr. John Feckenham to be abbot of Westminster *for three years only*. From the first chapter in 1617 the elections were quadriennial.

Priors of St. Gregory.

FRANCIS ATROBOS was elected at the first general chapter, in 1617. Weldon (p. 135) describes him as "a man of a most meek and gentle disposition, who had laudably executed the offices of greatest concern in the congregation, and had suffered imprisonment and exiles for the faith, and was waxed white in the apostolical labours of the mission." Ob. 10th June, 1626.

LEANDER of St. Martin, *alias* JOHN JONES, D.D., was elected at the second general chapter holden at Douay, 2d July, 1621, and re-elected at the fourth general chapter, 1629. He was connected with the Scudamore family of Kentchurch, in Herefordshire, was educated at Westminster School and

* See Alban Butler's *Travels*, p. 47.

† This appears also to have been the *ancient* custom in England. (*Apostolatus*, part ii. p. 60.)

at St. John's College, Oxford, and was intended for the legal profession. Persecution for his adherence to Catholic principles necessitated him to return to London, and there he found his parents and brothers attacked with the plague, which carried them off a few days later. The shock decided him to abandon his prospects of legal fame, and to dedicate himself to God in the ecclesiastical state. Proceeding to the English College of St. Alban's at Valladolid, he there applied himself diligently to theological studies; but after some years he joined the order of St. Benedict, in St. Martin's monastery at Compostella.* As a scholar he had few equals, excelling in his knowledge of the oriental languages. For nearly twenty-four years he continued Professor of Divinity and of Hebrew; and, as Weldon affirms (p. 78), was "an accomplished rhetorician, poet, Grecian, and Latinist." His society was much courted by literary men, especially by his fellow-collegian at Oxford, the celebrated Dr. Laud. To Henrietta of France, queen consort of Charles I., his company and services were most acceptable. After discharging the highest offices of the order, he died in London on the 27th of December, 1635, about seventy years old, "much lamented and very nobly attended to his grave, which was the first made at Somerset Palace, in the Queen's chapel, consecrated but four days before."*

RUDERIND BARLOW, elder brother to the martyr, Ambrose Barlow. We have mentioned him as being Superior at Douay before the union. At the third general chapter, 2d July, 1625, at Douay, he was re-elected prior. He was descended of a respectable family in Lancashire, and justly ranks amongst the ablest men of his time; but his talents were only excelled by his modesty and humility (*Weldon*, p. 83). He died on 19th September, 1656, æt. 72, rel. 51, sac. 38, and was buried before his stall in the choir of St. Gregory's church.

JOSEPH FRERE, elected in the fifth general chapter, 5th August, 1633, and continued in office for eight years. During his priorship, Pope Urban VIIIth's Bull *Plantata*, dated 12th July, 1633, was issued, establishing the English Benedictine Congregation in its ancient rights and privileges. Ob. 10th January, 1694, at Douay, aged 96, rel. 80!

JOHN MEUTISSE, elected at the eighth general chapter, 1641, and for twelve consecutive years was continued in office.

* See also the preface to Harpsfield's *Church History*, Douay, 1622; Wood's *Hist. and Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* lib. ii. p. 308.

To the good nuns at Cambray he rendered valuable services in the early part of their establishment. After some time laudably spent in the mission, he went to his repose and recompence, 5th May, 1666.

BERNARD PALMES, of Yorkshire, elected in the eleventh general chapter at Paris, in July 1653. At the expiration of his quadriennium he was appointed procurator at Rome.* He was taken ill at Gratz, in Styria, and died there in a monastery of the order, 25th December, 1663, "and was very honourably interred." (*Weldon*, p. 182.)

BENNET STAPYLTON, D.D. elected at the twelfth general chapter at Paris, in 1657, and held office until the fourteenth general chapter, which was delayed on account of the plague at Douay until 1666. Altogether he served the English mission for twenty years. At the fifteenth general chapter, at London, 1669, whilst chaplain to Queen Catharine, he was elected president, and was continued in that office until his death, which took place at Dieulwart, on 4th August, 1680, æt. 58, prof. 38, sac. 34. He was buried in that conventual church. He was the eldest son of the Stapelton family of Carlton, but renounced all to become a monk.

AUSTIN CONIERS was elected in 1666, but within a year I lose sight of him, when

GODRICK BLOUNT of Fawley, Berks, succeeded him; and he died 2d September, 1699. F. Alexius Caryll supplied for the remainder of his quadriennium.

WILLIAM HITCHCOCK followed, and was re-elected in 1673. In the nineteenth general chapter, holden in St. James's, London, in 1685, he was re-appointed prior, and governed the community for eight years more, *i.e.* to 1693. He died 11th August, 1711.

N.B. We regret that he wrote the letter to the procurator at Rome, bearing date 20th February, 1676; but much more that Mr. Dodd should have published so private a communication in vol. iii. of his *Church History*, p. 392.

AUSTIN HOWARD, elected in 1677. This worthy Father died 26th August, 1716.

JEROME HESKETH was elected in 1681.

* Mr. Dodd (*Church History*, vol. iii. p. 313) mistakes in saying that "F. Thomas White, being chosen prior, died of the plague at Douay in 1654." The fact is, the *President* Bennet (Claude) White died on 14th October, 1654, at St. Edmund's, at Paris, æt. 72, sac. 46, rel. 50, having spent thirty-six years in the mission, and was honourably interred in St. Margaret's chapel in the abbey church of St. Germaine.

JOHN PHILLIPSON succeeded in 1693, and for eight years successively remained in office. Ob. 18th September, 1739.

MICHAEL PULLEIN, elected in the twenty-third general chapter at Douay, in 1701, and again in 1710. Ob. February 3d, 1723.

CUTHBERT TATHAM was appointed at the twenty-fourth chapter holden at Douay, 1705, on the elect, William Phillips, declining the office.

F. PHILIP METHAM succeeded at the twenty-sixth general chapter, 1714; but died in office shortly after.

F. EDWARD CHORLEY followed in 1715.

F. JOHN STOURTON, elected in 1717. He was eighth and youngest son of William, eleventh Lord Stourton, by Elizabeth his wife, daughter of Sir John Preston. His death occurred at Antwerp, 3d October, 1748, as I learn from the journal of F. Darbyshire, O.S.D. who attended him.

F. WILLIAM PRETELL succeeded in 1721, who resigned after some time, when

F. ANTHONY ORD was appointed to supply his quadriennium. He died in office, 26th January, 1725.

LAURENCE YORK, D.D. was appointed to succeed, and served for four years. In the sequel was sent to the Bath mission. Bishop Prichard, V.A. of the Western District, obtained him for his coadjutor in the episcopal office. He was consecrated as Bishop of Niba in 1741, and nine years later the charge of the vicariat devolved upon him by the death of that senior prelate. In 1764, at his earnest entreaty, the Holy See consented to accept his resignation, when he retired to his dear convent at Douay, where he closed a useful and honourable life, 14th April, 1770.

BASIL WARWICK was elected in 1729. Ob. 29th April, 1732.

THOMAS NELSON followed in 1733. Ob. 8th February, 1738.

BENEDICT STEARE, elected in 1739. Ob. 18th January, 1780.

ALEXIUS SHEPHERD, elected in 1745; re-elected, and died in office, 2d August, 1755.

AUGUSTINE MOORE, after governing nearly twenty years, died also prior, 15th June, 1775.

WILLIAM (GREGORY) SHARROCK, elected in 1775, resigned

the office on his promotion to the see of Telmessus, as coadjutor to Bishop Walmesley, to which he was consecrated at Wardour on 12th August, 1780. He succeeded to the administration of the vicariat in 1797, and worthily governed it until his pious death at Bath, 17th October, 1809, æt. 67. He was buried near Bishop Walmesley in St. Joseph's chapel, Bristol.

JAMES (JEROME) SHARROCK, younger brother of the Bishop, succeeded to the priorship in 1780. How gratifying to read in the admirable "Narrative, by the late Rev. Joseph Hodgson," of the seizure of the Secular College at Douay, and the deportation of its inmates to Dourlens, of the cordial sympathy and practical charity of this good prior and his brethren to the poor sufferers! See the *Catholic Magazine* of 1831. Forced himself to emigrate in 1793, he found an asylum for his community at Acton Burnell, the hospitable seat of Sir Edward Smythe, Bart. His episcopal brother was anxious to have him for his associate in the pontifical duties. Rome approved the choice, and issued the Bulls, dated 19th April, 1806, constituting him Bishop of Themiscyra; but the humility of the prior could not be prevailed upon to accept the dignity, and he died in the arms of his devoted monks on 1st April, 1808, æt. 58.

RICHARD (PETER) KENDALL was the next prior. Just before God called him to his recompence (which happened at Wooton, on 26th March, 1814), he had completed the purchase of Downside, near Bath, for the present convent and college. The community took possession of this valuable property 25th April, 1814.

THOMAS LAWSON was elected 10th May, 1814; resigned 23d July, 1818; died at Salford, 23d April, 1830.

DR. LUKE BARBER. He had taken the habit 26th April, 1807, and was wisely selected prior in the room of F. Lawson. During the twelve years of his government, St. Gregory's College increased in numbers and merited fame. On 10th July, 1823, he opened the beautiful new church, the principal object of attention in every well-regulated community. His services being now required at Salford,

REV. GEORGE TURNER was appointed prior on 24th November, 1830. He is now the respected director of St. Mary's Priory at Princethorpe, near Coventry.

DR. THOMAS (JOSEPH) BROWN was chosen at the chapter 18th July, 1834; his six years' government was eminently

useful and satisfactory. Our readers are aware that the Holy See, in its wisdom, selected him for the first Bishop of the new vicariat of Wales, and that he was consecrated by the title of Bishop of Apollonia, at St. John's Chapel, Bath, on 28th October, 1840. *Florescat.*

JOSEPH WILSON succeeded in 1840, and does honour to his office by his energy and considerate attention to the comfort and happiness of all around him.

CHAPTER II.

St. Laurence's Convent at Dieulouard or Dieulwart, near Verdun, in the Diocese of Toul, and Province of Lorraine.

In the month of December, 1606, the energetic F. Bradshaw, mentioned in the preceding chapter, obtained a grant of an old collegiate establishment dedicated to St. Laurence, with a small farm in Jaillon, for his English Benedictines. The Bishop of Toul confirmed the donation on 18th April, 1609. In accomplishing this, the zealous Father was powerfully assisted by Dr. Arthur Pitts, Theologian to the neighbouring abbey of nuns at Remêremont, and canon of the church at Liverdun. That learned and beneficed clergyman (ob. 17th October, 1616) had been "very instant, however, that Dieulwart should be the head of the English congregation, and the chief residence of the president-general thereof" (*Weldon*, p. 45). It took the form of a convent in 1608.

It appears that F. Nicholas Fitzjames* governed the house for a time, also F. George Brown and F. Edward Mayhew, before the union was established in the first general chapter, in the summer of 1617.

Priors.

JOCELIN ELMER was elected at the first general chapter, holden on the 1st June, 1617, at St. Andrew's House, Paris (*Apostolatus*, part ii. p. 171); he was re-elected at the fourth general chapter at Douay, 2d July, 1629; and his system of government gave such satisfaction, that for the next twelve consecutive years he was continued in that office. According to *Weldon* (p. 170), he died on 1st July, 1651, "famous for his holy and severe life, by which he gave a great edification every where. He lies interred at St. Malo's."

* Born at Redlinch, county Somerset; professed 15th May, 1608, and executed for some years the office of Master of Novices. The venerable man, at the age of 92, died at Stourton, Wilts, on 16th May, 1652. (*Weldon*, p. 45.)

COLUMBANUS MALON succeeded in 1621. He was a native of Lancashire, was clothed by F. Leander of St. Martin, at Rheims, 2d September, 1608, and professed 13th Sept. 1609; "a person of a most innocent life, and of great example in all kind of virtues; an exact observer of regular discipline, a constant practiser of rigorous penance. He passed from the offices of professor of philosophy, subprior of Douay, secretary of the president, &c. to be prior of Dieulwart, where, in the second year of his government, he saint-like slept in our Lord, on the feast of All Saints, 1623" (*Weldon*, p. 49). The Necrology inaccurately fixes his death on 13th September that year.*

LAURENCE REYNER, elder brother of Dom Clement Reyner, elected in the third general chapter at Douay, 2d July, 1625. He was re-elected for another quadriennium in 1653; but on the death of the president F. Claude White in 1654, that important office devolved upon him. Afterwards proceeding to the mission, he died in the north of England on Good Friday (8th April), 1664, æt. 82. He was wonderfully zealous in gaining souls to Heaven, a patient sufferer of many persecutions and long imprisonments, and a great promoter of regular discipline. (*Weldon*, p. 182.)

CUTHBERT HORSLEY supplied the remainder of his predecessor's quadriennium, had been elected prior 9th August, 1641, and indeed continued to govern his brethren for nearly thirty years, until 1673. He was never employed on the mission. Released from the burden of superiority, he employed his leisure in preparing for eternity, into which he entered on the 21st December, 1777, aged about 80. (*Weldon*, p. 196.)

THOMAS (GREGORY) HESKETH, D.D., elected at the sixteenth general chapter in 1673. Died at Paris, 22d October, 1695.

JOHN GIRLINGTON succeeded in 1677, but of whom I can recover no details.

BERNARD GREGSON, elected at the eighteenth chapter at Paris, 1681, on F. Austin Mather's declining office. This prior being called to serve the Royal Chapel of her Majesty in London, was succeeded for the remainder of his term by F. James Mather, of Fishwick Hall, near Preston. F. Gregson was re-elected for another quadriennium in 1685.

* We trust that the able annalist of the Congregation, F. Peter (Athanasius) Allanson, will revise this Necrology, which has many omissions, several repetitions of names, and notorious anachronisms.

JAMES MATHER, elected at the twentieth general chapter at Paris, 1689, was re-elected in 1701, but refused to serve. Ob. 16th January, 1724.

LAURENCE CHAMPNEY, elected in 1693, presided till 1701; is known to have filled the office again before his death, 21st April, 1732, but the precise date cannot be determined.

FRANCIS WATMOUGH, elected in 1701, and certainly governed for the ensuing nine years, and is known to have filled several quadrienniums before his death, 15th August, 1733; but we have no documents to fix the dates.*

ROBERT HARDCASTLE, elected in 1710. He died 27th December, 1741.

BERNARD CATARATT was elected in 1737, and remained in office for sixteen years. He died 9th September, 1781.

AMBROSE KAYE succeeded in 1753, and held office for twelve successive years.

GEO. (GREGORY) COWLEY, elected in 1765, and continued prior for eight years. This worthy superior died at Vernon Hall, Lancashire, 19th June, 1799.

DUNSTAN HOLINESS, elected in 1773, and retained office for eight years. He died 25th June, 1782.

JEROME MARSH succeeded in 1781. He died at Holme, county of York, 16th February, 1798.

JEROME COUPE followed in 1785, of whom I can glean no particulars.

RICHARD MARSH (of whom I shall have to speak more at large later). He was elected in a critical period, 1789. With difficulty he could escape with two of his religious on 12th October, 1793: that very night the convent was invested by a cordon of armed revolutionists. Four of his subjects were arrested and conveyed prisoners to Pont-à-Mousson. The four that remained on the premises experienced such shameful treatment and privations, as put an end to the lives of all but one; for the Rev. Maurice Farrel, an elderly priest, turned out of the convent, died in confinement; and James Johnson

* In a letter received from Dr. Rooker, dated Ampleforth College, 15th November, 1821, he says: "Of the six following quadrienniums I find no account whatever; but from the Necrologies I learn that Laurence Champney was prior for *one* quadriennium, and Francis Watmough for *three*. N.B. On 13th October, 1717, the convent was visited with a destructive fire, which consumed the *valuable library*, commenced and enriched by Dom Gabriel Giffard; also many original deeds in the archives, and the greater part of the buildings."

and Charles Allour sunk under their hardships shortly after their liberation. He continued in the government of the Dieulwart monks at Vernon Hall, near St. Helen's, Lancashire, until his resignation in 1802, when F. Francis (Anselm) Appleton succeeded him. Towards the end of his priorship, the community, increased by the arrivals from Lamspring, removed to Ampleforth, near York, late the property of the Hon. Miss Fairfax. At the expiration of his quadriennium, F. Dunstan Tarleton was elected prior, but declining to accept the responsibility, Dr. Marsh, during this interval, attended when he could, leaving the Rev. Thomas (Clement) Rishton (who had been clothed at Lamspring, 19th November, 1800,) as acting superior. This course was pursued till 1810, when F. Thomas (Gregory) Robinson assumed the government of the house, which he held for six successive years. On his resignation, F. Rishton was re-appointed prior, who at the end of two years was succeeded by F. Thomas (Laurence) Burgess, who was prior until the spring of 1830, when, having obtained his secularisation, together with his brethren Drs. Rooker and Brindle and Rev. Edward Metcalf, the college was threatened with dissolution. But it pleased God to raise up a host in F. Richard (Adrian) Towers, who restored life and energy to the college. At the expiration of his quadriennium, F. Samuel (Bede) Day succeeded, and was followed by the Rev. Thomas (Anselm) Cockshoot, who presided for eight years. In 1846, F. Richard (Anselm) Prest was elected prior; and at the late chapter, July 1850, F. Wilfrid Cooper was installed prior; and we trust that Ampleforth will continue to unite in itself the merits of Lamspring Abbey and Dieulwart Priory, conveying wisdom into holy souls and making friends unto God.

CHAPTER III.

St. Bennet's Establishment at St. Malo.

FATHER GABRIEL of St. Mary, *alias* DR. GIFFARD, afterwards Archbishop of Rheims, may fairly be regarded as the founder of this monastery. In conjunction with F. John Barnes, this learned doctor and most humble religious had received directions from his superior, F. Bradshaw, to proceed to Spain, in order to raise moneys for the increasing but impoverished community at Dieulwart. Whilst waiting at St. Malo for a vessel and a favourable wind to take him to Spain, he made the acquaintance of the Bishop, Monseigneur Guillaume le Gouverneur, and of the principal citizens, who were so charmed with his pulpit eloquence, his saintly ex-

ample and pleasing manners, that they sent a formal invitation to abandon the expedition to Spain, and to fix his residence amongst them. F. Bradshaw approved of this proposal, and in the months of August and September that year (1611) forwarded a reinforcement of his religious, in the persons of FF. Placid Hilton *alias* Musgrave, Mellitus Balthorpe, Thomas Green, Boniface Kemp or Kipton, Columban Malon, and Bennet D'Orgain, to commence the English Benedictine convent. They were placed in the house of the theologal, which dignity the Bishop conferred on Dr. Giffard, and on F. Hilton the preceptorial, which was to teach the children of the town. This was done with great contentment to all concerned (*Weldon*, p. 57). But, alas, at length the enemy of human happiness succeeded in sowing the tares of envy in the minds and hearts of some of the cathedral chapter; and for the sake of peace and charity, Dr. Giffard, in 1616, purchased a house and garden in the city, "and transferred his little yet laborious community from the theologal mansion to the new acquisition" (*Weldon*, p. 106). This was improved two years later by the additional purchase of another house and garden. Their chapel, dedicated to St. Bennet, was opened for divine service on 29th December, 1621.

Priors.

DR. WILLIAM GIFFARD, of an ancient and illustrious family, son of John Giffard, Esq., by his wife Elizabeth (Throgmorton), was born in 1555. At a proper age he was sent to Lincoln College, Oxford, where he pursued his studies for at least four years; thence proceeded to Louvain, where he went through a course of divinity under the celebrated Bellarmine, and passed Bachelor of that faculty. The degree of Doctor was conferred on 14th November, 1584, at Pont-à-Mousson, with great applause. For eleven years he filled the chair of professor of theology at Rheims with the highest commendation. To Henry Duke of Guise, to his brother Lewis Cardinal-Archbishop of Rheims, to Cardinals Bellarmine and Allen, to the Saints Charles Borromæus and Francis de Sales, he was greatly endeared, and to Pope Clement VIII. who collated him to the Deanery of Lisle. Yet whilst France and Italy rang with his praises as an orator and a theologian, he was meditating to bury himself in the monastic cloister. Rector of the University of Rheims, he received the Benedictine habit from the hands of F. Leander of St. Martin, in the great Abbey of St. Remi in that city, and in the following year made his profession in the chapter-house at Dieulwart.

During his priorship at St. Malo's, the above-mentioned Cardinal-Archbishop of Rheims obtained him for his coadjutor in the episcopal office, and he was consecrated by the title of Bishop of Archidapolis, on whose death three years later Dr. Giffard succeeded his Grace as Archbishop and Duke of Rheims, first peer of France, and legate born of the Holy See. This truly great and apostolic man died in Holy Week, 11th April, 1629. His remains were deposited behind the high altar of his cathedral; but his heart was bequeathed to the Benedictine nunnery of St. Peter in that city, and was laid in their choir before the high altar with a suitable inscription. (*Weldon*, p. 142.)

PAULINUS GREENWOOD, of Brentwood in Essex, was the first professed in the *new* house of St. Gregory at Douay, 10th January, 1612. Succeeding Prior Giffard, promoted to episcopacy, he continued in office for eight years. Afterwards repairing to the mission, he suffered long imprisonment at the Gate-house, London, for the faith; but died at Oxford, 27th November, 1645.

JOCELIN ELMER, elected 2d July, 1625; he had previously filled the office of prior at Dieulwart. Re-elected here at the tenth general chapter, 1649, he died within two years later, viz. 12th January, 1651, and was buried amongst his brethren.

ADEODATUS L'ANGEVIN, elected vice-prior at the fourth general chapter, holden at Douay, 2d July, 1629, and continued to govern the house until 1641, after which I lose all traces of him.

ROBERT (GABRIEL) BRETT succeeded F. Adeodatus in 1641; held office for the next eight years; was re-elected in 1657 for another quadriennium. He was son to Sir Alexander Brett, of White Staunton in Somersetshire, and nephew to Dr. Giffard, under whom he became a monk of St. Malo's. Ob. 12th August, 1665, æt. 66. (*Weldon*, p. 184.)

JOHN MEUTISSE, at the petition of the convent, in lieu of F. Ildefonsus Cliffe, who had been chosen at the eleventh chapter, 1653. (See *Weldon*, p. 171.) We have mentioned F. Meutisse in the first chapter.

THOMAS ANDERTON succeeded in 1661; died 9th October, 1671.

BENNET NELSON, elected at the fourteenth general chapter, which, on account of the plague raging at Douay, was begun, says *Weldon* (p. 185), at the Old Bailey, at London, 1st May, 1666. In consequence of an agreement between the

president, F. Austin Hungate, and the French Benedictines of the congregation of St. Maur, he surrendered shortly after his convent into their hands: his manner of submission gave much edification to all parties. The president offered him a convenient chaplaincy with his own niece, Lady Fairfax, in Yorkshire; but he preferred his cloister at St. Edmund's, Paris, to which he retired. He died there 3d September, 1699, æt. 81, rel. 59. The Maurist monks paid 200 pistoles yearly to the English congregation for this surrender.

The last person professed at St. Malo was WILLIAM (BEDE) THORNTON. Ob. 10th April, 1694.

Reviews.

RISE, PROGRESS, AND RESULTS OF PUSEYISM.

Lectures on certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church. By John Henry Newman, Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Burns and Lambert.

WHEN a great man draws near his end, his friends begin to think of writing his biography. The Oxford movement of 1833 has already entered upon its second childhood, but we fear that no exclusively friendly hand is preparing to pen its memoirs. In a certain sense, however, we may call ourselves its friends; and therefore, before it has entirely ceased to be, we shall venture upon a brief sketch of its life, by way of offering some trifling contributions to its future chroniclers, when men come to review the ecclesiastical history of England in its progress from Protestantism to Catholicism.

In the year 1833, a small band of Oxford Protestants formed themselves into a private association for the propagation of what were termed "Church principles." At the beginning of that year, the old High-Church party were stricken with dismay at the progress of reform in politics and latitudinarianism in religion. Educated in the prejudices of the age, they viewed with nearly equal horror a Whig, a Radical, a Catholic, a Quaker, a Baptist, a Socinian, and a Jew; and in the events of the four preceding years, they beheld prognostics of the utter destruction of all they held most dear. In 1829, Catholic Emancipation was carried. In 1830, the

revolution overthrew "legitimacy" in France. In 1831, the Reform Bill became law in England. "Church Reform" was among the most popular of cries. The Bishops were hated and laughed at; a separation of Church and State seemed imminent; and at last, when ten Irish Protestant bishoprics were suddenly abolished by Act of Parliament, the patience of High-Churchmen was exhausted, and the time appeared ripe for the calling into action a wide-spread movement in defence of things as they were. Meanwhile the press teemed with proposals for mending the Church of England itself. Lord Henley (Sir Robert Peel's brother-in-law) and Dr. Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, were among the foremost in the ranks of the pamphleteers. Dr. Arnold of Rugby proposed that *all* sects and creeds should be united by Act of Parliament, and that in one and the same building, in the course of one and the same Sunday, Catholics, Establishmentarians, and Dissenters of all denominations, should successively worship and preach; and the Athanasian Creed was condemned in the Establishment itself, as obsolete, barbarous, and bloodthirsty.

It was in the early part of the long vacation, when Oxford assumes its most dreary aspect, and the heat of the maturing summer drives all but a few lingering gownsmen from its academic shades, that two members of the University met frequently in the common-room of Oriel College, and exchanged words of mourning sympathy on the evils of the times. So it happened that these two fitly represented the two schools of religious opinion now about to be for a time united in energetic action for the defence of an apparently common cause. Richard Hurrell Froude and William Palmer were as striking embodiments of the Catholic and the Protestant tendencies of mind as all England could supply. The former has long since been called away from this life; and his course was so short, that the world in general knew little of the real power he had exercised in giving a definite direction to the movement, till the publication of two volumes of his *Remains* in the year 1838. Sweet and affectionate in disposition to no ordinary degree, clear-sighted beyond most of his companions, self-denying to an extent wonderful among Protestants, he exerted an influence of the most efficacious description on many minds, notwithstanding a certain waywardness of character and love of paradoxical statement singularly unwelcome to the proprieties of Oxford. His personal history is, in truth, so striking, as an illustration of the inward workings of many minds who are without the Catholic Church, yet are mysteriously subjected to her sway, that no correct

idea can be formed of the real origin of the Tract movement without a brief sketch of his character.

Richard Hurrell Froude was the son of Archdeacon Froude, and was born at Dartington, in the county of Devon, in the year 1803. He died of consumption, on the 28th of February, 1836, when he was nearly thirty-three years old, after an illness of four years and a half. He was educated at Eton and Oxford; gained high, though not the highest, honours, both in classics and mathematics; and was elected fellow of Oriel College in 1826. From 1827 to 1830 he was one of the College tutors, and in 1828 he took orders in the Anglican Church.

The singular genuineness of his character is displayed in the fact, that for some time he kept a private religious journal, which stands in most marked contrast to all ordinary Protestant diaries. A more determined and more successful effort at self-examination, and at recording the real truth respecting his own sins, was probably never accomplished out of the Catholic Church. His journal, with selections from his letters, which bear a like impress of living truthfulness, were given to the world when Tractarianism was become notorious, and the astonishment of the Antipuseyite world was extreme. The more enlightened reader marked with deep interest the rapid progress of Froude's mind towards Catholic truth and towards religious maturity, even amidst occasional outbursts of anticatholic ignorance of facts, and in conjunction with that timid, trembling grasp of Catholic doctrine, and that rash, though earnest, asceticism, which often characterise the early stages of conversion to the faith. Ultraprotestants, more acute than admiring Puseyites, discerned the real tendencies of his mind, and notwithstanding his scattered words of anti-roman prejudice, denounced him as a Papist at heart, and as the most odious of the Oxford plotters against Protestantism. Certainly he appears to have been the first who detected the true character of the "reformers" from their own acts and writings; and the vehement onslaughts of the *British Critic* in after years were but the argumentative expression of the epigrammatic sayings in which Froude had been wont to utter his abhorrence of Cranmer, Ridley, Jewell, and the whole school of religious rebels.

It is so seldom that the inward workings of the minds of conscientious Protestants are displayed to Catholics, that a few extracts from the journal alluded to will be welcome to our readers. They were written, it should be noted, in the year 1826, when Froude was only twenty-three years old, seven years before the Tract movement began to make asceticism

the custom at Oxford, and while the author possessed few means of access to living Catholics and Catholic writers. The first is on fasting and ceremonies :

“ Respecting Church-regulations for fasts and abstinence, I consider that if the forms of *society* are calculated to make each individual feel his proper place with reference to others, and to help us in acting right in this relation, it cannot be absurd to keep up *religious* ceremonies, which may be witnesses to us of the presence of the great King, and of the way of acting and thinking which suits our relation to Him.” (Sept. 1st, 1826.)

Again, on penance :

“ It came into my head this morning, that it would be a good thing for me to set apart some days in the year for the commemoration of my worst acts of sin. I find, that as the feeling in which they originated becomes extinct, I am too apt to forget that it was myself who was guilty of them, and to look on the actions themselves as no longer connected with me, now that God in his goodness has delivered me from the temptation to repeat them. Besides, I think it would be the safest way of doing penance, and the most sure to exclude any feeling of self-complacency from obtruding itself on my humiliation and self-chastisement.” (Sept. 27th, 1826.)

The next is a longer extract. The opening paragraph alludes to a subject which occurs in other parts of the Journal also, namely, a certain sense of perplexity and mingled moral and intellectual distress, which resulted from his entering into arguments on religious subjects beyond the formal routine of Anglican doctrine and practice. At such times the sincere Protestant frequently feels with more than ordinary keenness the absence of that gift of *faith* which is the Catholic's privilege, and without which he is ever rushing into unreality, exaggerations, and contradictions. Froude was unlike others only in that he recognised and was pained at this uncomfortable phenomenon. The extract also shews *how* he fasted, excessive fasting being only one of the bodily austerities he put in practice; while it displays the clearness and honesty with which he aimed at a moral standard of perfection, most unusual among his companions.

“ Had a walk with N. Insensibly got talking in a way to let him infer I was trying to alter myself. Also allowed myself to argue. Was puzzled as usual, and have been uncomfortable and abstracted ever since. Once doubted whether I had not been wrong, which made me ridiculously uneasy.

“ Felt once as if I would have accepted ——'s invitation

on Friday, if I had expected a party to my taste ; and believe my motive was not sound at the bottom, as I am afraid is the case with all my motives. I read and go to chapel because they are helps to get through the day. I use self-denial because I believe it the way to make the most of our pleasures ; and besides, it has a tendency to give me what is essential to taking my place in society—self-command. Besides which, if my feelings are in any respect right, if I have any real wish to conform my will to that of the Lord, and really to correct my motives and feelings, it is because, having tried every other way which I fancied might lead to happiness, I have been either thwarted in my endeavours or disappointed in success. I am driven to the attempt after piety as a last resource ; I seek to be hidden, and in the Lord's presence, not upon choice, but because I have no where else to hide myself. I give up nothing, and ask for every thing. Can such an offering as mine have any thing acceptable in it ? Can actions originating in such a temper have any tendency to make me better, or to procure the blessing and grace of God ? And yet now I am proud of this that I have written, and think that the knowledge it shews of myself implies a greatness of mind ; and I sometimes compare myself to Solomon in the beginning of Ecclesiastes.

“ Was disgustingly ostentatious at dinner in asking for a china plate* directly, as I had finished my meat. I did it on purpose too, that the others might see I ate so much less than they did. Read affectedly in evening chapel. I look forward to to-morrow with apprehension, and expect uncommon tedium before night. I hope I shall be able to abstain altogether, and that the Lord will so purify my motives, that I may benefit from this my spiritual sustenance. The affair of the argument proves to me that I am very proud.

“ If God has not given me such high talents as I suppose, what harm can it be to me to find it out ? If being in the wrong really diminished my understanding, there might be more ground for being uncomfortable. But it is not argument that must get the better of this folly.

“ I have allowed myself to be provoked and bothered at the ———'s having cut up my evening, and not having been sufficiently respectful. How can I expect my trespasses to be forgiven ?

“ *Nov. 10th.*—Fell quite short of my wishes with respect to the rigour of to-day's fast, though I am quite willing to believe not unpardonably : I tasted nothing till after half-past

* In college, meat is served on pewter.

eight in the evening, and before that had undergone more uncomfortableness, both of body and mind, than any fast has as yet occasioned me, having, I hope, laid a sort of foundation, on which I may gradually build up the fit spending of a fast in calling my sins to remembrance. But I made rather a more hearty tea than usual (quite giving up the notion of a fast) in W.'s rooms, and by this weakness have occasioned another slip. For having been treated, as I think, without sufficient respect by the youngest —, I allowed myself to be vexed, and to think of how I ought to have set him down all the rest of the evening, instead of receiving it with thankfulness from God as an instrument of humility. Also I will record another error, common indeed with me, and which for that reason I have hitherto overlooked, *i.e.* speaking severely of another without a cause. I said I thought — an ass, when there was not the least occasion for me to express my sentiments about him; and yet I, so severe on the follies, and so bitter against the slightest injuries I get from others, am now presenting myself before my great Father, to ask for mercy on my most foul sins, and forgiveness for the most excessive injuries. 'How shall I be delivered from the body of this death!' (Nov. 9, 1826.)

Two years after the commencement of the Tracts, he thus writes to a friend who thought it right to mix vehement attacks upon Catholics with his advocacy of "Anglo-Catholic" views:

"Before I finish this, I must enter another protest against your cursing and swearing at the end of — (naming the work in question) — [against the Romanists], as you do. What good can it do? And I call it uncharitable to an excess. How mistaken we may ourselves be on many points that are only gradually opening on us! Surely you should reserve 'blasphemous,' 'impious,' &c. for the denial of the articles of faith."

A few of his sayings in conversation are recorded, from which the following are to our purpose. The first is extremely acute:

"No one can become a great man who speaks of himself. He who speaks of himself, thereby makes himself inferior to the person he addresses."

The rest shew his secret feelings towards the truth, and his gradual approximation towards its confession:

"Catholic enthusiasts may be hated; but they never can become ridiculous, as the Methodists are."

"I observe in the pictures of the Bishops of the middle ages, a curious expression, as if neither of man or woman, — a kind of feminine sternness."

"The Reformation was a limb badly set; it must be broken again in order to be righted." [This saying was among those which so mightily affronted the Antitractarian party.]

"I wonder a thoughtful fellow like H. does not get to hate the Reformers faster. I think as soon as I began to know —, I felt they were the very kind of fellows he would most have hated and despised if he had known them."

"I never could be a Romanist; I never could think all those things in Pope Pius's Creed necessary to salvation. But I do not see what harm an ordinary Romanist gets from thinking so."

"A good many of the young persons now have got into a way of 'performing the services impressively.' — has a little of it. I don't suppose the Catholic service *could* be 'performed impressively.'"

"— shews a hatred and contempt for parts of the saintly character, which *is* immorality; as for example, he hates the temper which does not see and yet believes."

In a few charming little occasional poems, Froude at times poured forth his *most* secret thoughts. The following (written just before the commencement of the 'Tracts') is among the many proofs his writings furnish of his intense sense, that, after all, he had yet to find the eternal truth of God.

"O Lord, I hear, but can it be
The gracious word was meant for me?
O Lord, I thirst, but who shall tell
The secret of that living well,
By whose waters I may rest,
And slake this lip unblest?"

O Lord, I will, but cannot do,
My heart is hard, my faith untrue:
The Spirit and the Bride say, Come;
The eternal, ever-blessed Home
Op'd its portals at my birth,
But I am chained to earth.

The golden keys each eve and morn —
I see them with a heart forlorn,
Lest they should iron prove to me:
Oh, set my heart at liberty.
May I seize what Thou dost give,
Seize tremblingly, and live!"

Ten days before these stanzas were written by Froude at Oxford, another, bound closely to him by the ties of affection and friendship, and soon about to be his colleague in commencing the movement, was becalmed in the sun off the coast

of Sardinia, and on the deck of a Sicilian sailing vessel, while the low gurgling of the gently moving waves against the prow scarce broke the silence of the tideless Mediterranean, he too spoke in verse thoughts too deep for common utterance, and the prayer he poured forth was answered by Him who heard, according to his own divine and merciful interpretation of its petitions. Few persons probably know that the following lines, published some time afterwards, were written *before* the appearance of the Oxford Tracts:

“ FAITH.

“ Lead, kindly light, amid the encircling gloom ;
 Lead Thou me on !

The night is dark, and I am far from home—
 Lead Thou me on !

Keep Thou my feet ; I do not ask to see
The distant scene,—one step enough for me.

I was not ever thus, nor prayed that Thou
 Should'st lead me on !

I loved to choose and see my path, but now
 Lead Thou me on !

I loved the garish day, and, spite of fears,
Pride ruled my will : remember not past years.

So long thy power hath blest me, sure it still
 Will lead me on,

O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till
 The night is gone ;

And with the morn those Angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.”

Such were the inward yearnings of two hearts which then beat with loyal affection to the Anglican Church, in which they had been reared, and which in a few weeks were to communicate their fire to many another breast. It is clear that, from the first, the *ruling* minds in the movement were conscious of their ignorance, and, in the presence of Almighty God, *felt* that He was leading them they knew not whither.

Of these two, one, as has been said, was occupying the early part of the long vacation in conferences with a man of a totally different stamp.

William Palmer, of Worcester College, learned beyond the average of Protestant divines, and strong in his dislike to consistent Lutheranism,—William Palmer was as radically an Ultraprotestant at the very time when he aided in establishing

the Tracts, as when afterwards he wrote "Letters to N. Wiseman, D.D., calling himself Bishop of Melipotamus;" and when, on the demise of the *British Critic*, he undertook the management of a review which has rivalled the worst of Evangelical zealots in its misrepresentations of the Catholic faith. He was a fair representative of a vast portion of the party which by degrees took up the movement, whose chief aim appeared to be self-defence rather than a search after truth, and who at times seemed to apologise for Rome, only that they might the more vigorously repel the attacks of Nonconformity against Anglicanism. The personal alliance between the two ill-assorted coadjutors was speedily dissolved; and in a published Narrative of the events in which he had a share, Palmer confessed a conviction that Froude's influence was all along exerted in a direction opposed to his own.

Acting together, however, for a time, Froude and Palmer resolved that something must be done to defend the Establishment, now robbed of her ten Irish bishoprics, and threatened on every side. Their general idea was to establish some sort of association for the support of "Church principles." A few friends were consulted without loss of time. A few were already prepared to join in the scheme. In the beginning of the year, Mr. Palmer had been in correspondence with the Rev. Hugh James Rose, the editor of the *British Magazine*, then living at Hadleigh in Suffolk, and afterwards Principal of King's College, London. Rose, who has now been several years dead, was of a theological school akin to that of Palmer, but less gladiatorial in spirit. To him and to John Keble the poet the design was first communicated. Unlike Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, with whom his name was afterwards so constantly associated, Keble had always been attached to the old-fashioned High-Church class of Anglicans. His *Christian Year* was already giving promise of that extraordinary popularity which until recently (or even until now) it has retained. His great principle was expressed in the preface to that remarkable collection of poems. He thought that the grand desideratum of a religious mind should be *soberness*; and in the *Christian Year*, with its gentle tones, its steady proprieties, its sweet suggestions, its delicate imagery, its glimpses of truth, and its unintelligible meanderings of thoughts and words, he gave a second Bible to the well-intentioned, cautious, sensible, and domestic households of English Anglicanism. He had just been preaching before the University of Oxford a sermon on the suppression of the ten Irish bishoprics, which he viewed as a calamity of the most fearful kind, and condemned as an act of "national apostacy." "The legis-

lature of England and Ireland," he says in his preface to the published sermon, "(the members of which are not even bound to profess belief in the atonement,) this body has virtually usurped the commission of those whom our Saviour entrusted with *at least one voice* in making ecclesiastical laws on matters wholly or partly spiritual." Such being Mr. Keble's views—though his words "*at least one voice*" betray his real difference from the principles of such men as Froude—he very gladly entered into the suggestions proposed by him. The Rev. John Henry Newman, on his return from the continent, immediately took part in the deliberations; and after some correspondence, Froude and Palmer went down to confer with Rose at Hadleigh, where they met the only other of the original "conspirators" not yet named, the Hon. and Rev. Arthur Perceval, a High-Churchman of the antiroman caste, who, like Palmer, afterwards published an account of the part he took in organising the movement, and who, also like Palmer, speedily found that permanent co-operation with men like Froude and Newman, and even with Keble and their subsequent coadjutor Dr. Pusey, was practically an impossibility.

After this conference the "conspirators" proceeded to action. No terms of co-operation could be agreed upon, at once sufficiently comprehensive, explicit, and cautious, to ensure the *signatures* of even this small number of friends. Latent Establishmentarianism from the first refused to coalesce with latent Catholicism. Nevertheless, certain articles of agreement passed to and fro, and it was determined at once to commence acting upon the public mind in favour of the doctrine of the apostolical succession, as the keystone of the edifice of Church-government, and as the necessary means to a participation in the body and blood of our Blessed Lord. Books and tracts were immediately to be written. Propositions were made for the establishment of associations throughout the country for the maintenance of High-Church views; and clerical and lay petitions were prepared, addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It speedily became manifest that the movement must depend for success entirely upon the first of these instruments. The time was not come for Church Unions; and petitions and addresses to the Anglican prelates proved only the simplicity of the petitioners and the ultra-protestantism of the petitioned. Palmer, being a man of comparative leisure, went about the country, agitating wherever he could; and notwithstanding the frowns of dignitaries and the jealousies of the country parsons at these novel proceedings on the part of a few nameless young men at Oxford, an address was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury in

the following February, signed by nearly 7000 clergy of the Establishment. The petition really *said* scarcely any thing at all, and could conveniently be signed by men of all views who wished things to remain as they were. In the following May, a similar address was presented to the Archbishop by the laity, signed by 230,000 heads of families.

Of these 7000 clerical and 230,000 lay subscribers, wonderfully few were they who sympathised with the real opinions of the most influential of the leaders in the movement. When the *Tracts for the Times* commenced publication in the autumn of 1833, inexpressible must have been the bewilderment of the clerical conservatives of the Establishment, and the eminently respectable fathers and mothers of families who had been wont to consider the quiet comforts and peaceable mediocrity of their Bishops, their clergy, their Prayer-book, and their parsonages, as the *beau ideal* of perfection, and the summit beyond which it was presumption to wish for more. From the first, the Tracts were the work of individuals, for it was found impossible to subject them to the revision of any association, and they never possessed more than the general patronage of all the few persons we have mentioned as originating them. From the first, they displayed a daring vigour, a recklessness of secular consequences, and a determination to carry out truths to their legitimate conclusions. On the first page of the series, they wished the Anglican prelates the honour and blessedness of martyrdom! Hence, notwithstanding the freezing mediocrity and thoroughly anticatholic Anglicanism of many, if not of the greater part, of the first Tracts, they were early viewed with deep suspicion by the old school, who patronised them with cautious reserve, and shrugged their shoulders at the mention of the *extremes* to which these Oxford men seemed disposed to push their principles.

Such, then, was the tone of the earlier Oxford Tracts. The first volume was published in 1833-1834. The apostolical succession of Bishops, the value of ordinances, the perfections of the Book of Common Prayer, the *via media* of the Church of England as opposed to Romanism on the one side and Dissent on the other, and the independence of the Church, were its principal topics. The series also included several tracts called "Records of the Church," which consisted of short extracts from the writings of the Fathers, supposed to uphold the doctrines inculcated in the original papers. The moral and spiritual *strength* of the first volume, however, lay chiefly in a tract to which the author affixed his initials, on the duty of Fasting. From the time of the publication of this essay, Dr. Pusey's name became popularly associated

with the movement, and the world in general out of Oxford supposed him to be both its chief originator and its most influential guide. Both suppositions were erroneous. His personal influence in Oxford was for a long time considerable, as his tract on Baptism, published in 1834-1835, unquestionably was one of the most effective single publications to which the movement gave birth. Still, from the first, Tractarianism owed little or nothing of its *Catholic* tendencies to Dr. Pusey. To him it owed much of its unnatural preciseness and solemnity of tone, its exaggerated though sincere austerities, and its partial adoption of auricular confession. From first to last, nevertheless, Dr. Pusey never even understood the inmost feelings and principles of some of his coadjutors, and he was, in fact, a thorough Protestant. He appears never to have grasped the idea of the Catholic Church as a living body, commissioned to communicate the revealed truths of the Gospel to each individual soul. He has worshipped the Fathers, as the Evangelicals have worshipped the mere letter of King James's English translation of the Bible. His own private judgment has been his ultimate court of appeal, even when he has entered the lists in defence of the most "Romanising" of his friends, and been most unscrupulous in appropriating the writings of the "modern Church of Rome."

Of the first promoters of the movement, some either never wrote any of the Tracts, or speedily withdrew from active co-operation with their early associates. Rose wrote none; Palmer was only in part responsible for one single Tract (No. 15); and Perceval wrote no more than three, Nos. 23, 35, and 36. Other and bolder pens were early found to co-operate; but the actual number of Tract-writers was to the last but small.

Before the year 1833 was closed, an auxiliary series of papers, by Mr. Newman, began to appear in the *British Magazine*. *The Church of the Fathers*, afterwards republished in a single volume, far outstepped the cautious hints of the Tracts themselves; and furnished a striking indication of the actual sentiments of at least one of the "Tractarians," as they were speedily termed. What had been the early progress of the writer's mind, under the influence of the study of the primitive Fathers, he has himself described in the course of lectures delivered by him in the London Oratory.

"Even when I was a boy," he says, "my thoughts were turned to the early Church, and especially to the early Fathers, by the perusal of Milner's *Church History*, and I have never lost, I never have suffered a suspension of the impression, deep and most pleasurable, which his sketches of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine left

on my mind. From that time the vision of the Fathers was always, to my imagination, I may say, a paradise of delight, to the contemplation of which I directed my thoughts from time to time, whenever I was free from the engagements proper to my time of life. When I first began to read their works with attention and on system, I busied myself much in analysing them, and in cataloguing their doctrines and principles; and when I had thus proceeded very carefully and minutely for some space of time, I found, on looking back on what I had done, that I had scarcely done any thing at all, that I had gained very little from them, and that the Fathers I had been reading, which were exclusively those of the Antenicene period, as far as my reading was concerned, had very little in them. At the time I did not discover the reason of this result, though, on the retrospect, it was plain enough: I had read them simply on Protestant ideas, analysed and catalogued them on Protestant principles of division, and hunted for Protestant doctrines and usages in them. My headings ran, 'Justification by faith only,' 'Sanctification,' and the like. I knew not what to look for in them; I sought what was not there, I missed what was there; I laboured through the night, and caught nothing. But I should make one important exception: I rose from their perusal with a vivid perception of the divine institution, the prerogatives, and the gifts of the Episcopate; that is, with an implicit aversion to the Erastian principle.

"Some years afterwards I took up the study of them again, when I had occasion to employ myself on the history of Arianism. I read them with Bull's *Defensio*, as their key as far as his subject extended; but I am not aware that I made any other special doctrinal use of them at that time."

The Church of the Fathers, nevertheless, and those Tracts in which the same pen was clearly to be recognised, distinctly indicated that their author was already far ahead of Lutheranism as well as Erastianism, and that he had learnt not only the divine institution of the Episcopate, but many another Catholic truth from the records of Christian antiquity. *The Church of the Fathers*, even to a Catholic, is still a charming and interesting book. It is charming from the graces, at once refined and homely, of its style; from its judicious selection of some of the most stirring scenes and sweetest characters of ancient days; and from the singular, unhesitating faith with which its writer viewed the divine gifts and glorious deeds of saints and martyrs, even from amidst the dull incredulities and technicalities of the Anglican Establishment. To those who are interested in the history of this movement—and what Catholic is not?—*The Church of the Fathers* is also interesting, as a manifestation of the tendencies of its promoters, and as an example of the mode in which a conscientious and intelligent Protestant, in many respects orthodox in his faith,

would feel when thrown suddenly into the midst of the living realities of the Church of God.

Thus early, moreover, the Tractarians sent forth a *test* among their followers. The publication of *The Church of the Fathers* was a stroke of courage, for its very first chapters smote hard at Establishmentarianism, and a Fellow of an Oxford College was found daring enough to assert the supernatural efficacy of the relics of departed Saints. It was not enough that Mr. Newman, with manifest sincerity, eulogised the unreformed "British constitution," and pathetically mourned over "the good old time of King George the Third," and even hinted at the sanctity of the same Royal Protestant, in company with his predecessor "our blessed martyr St. Charles." Suspicions that things were going too far rapidly grew up in the first supporters of the Tracts. Men who hoped for demonstrations in favour of the Thirty-nine Articles and the Catechism, of the revenues of the Bishops and the privileges of the Universities, were puzzled when they read of the heroism of St. Ambrose, the penitence of Theodosius, the dogmatics of Vincentius, the conflicts of St. Anthony, and the apostolate of St. Martin. Still, *The Church of the Fathers* was widely read, and its influence was decisive. Its sketches were a realised romance to young and hopeful souls. Basil and Gregory, Gervasius and Protasius, Augustine and Athanasius, were Saints once more; and fond believers in the Church of England began already to anticipate a day when a Regius Professor might be committed to prison for defying a Prime Minister, and new fires consume some episcopal martyr for the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

Two short extracts from its pages will shew at once the style of the arguments which were interwoven with the narratives, and the direction in which its author must inevitably lead his readers. The first is the summing up of the narrative of the miracle wrought by the relics of SS. Gervasius and Protasius.

"On the whole, then, are we not in the following dilemma: If the miracle did not take place, then St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, men of name, said they had ascertained a fact which they did not ascertain, and said it in the face of enemies with an appeal to a whole city, and that continued during a quarter of a century. What instrument of refutation shall we devise against a case like this, neither so violently *à priori* as to supersede the Apostle's testimony, nor so fastidious of evidence as to imperil Tacitus or Cæsar?

"On the other hand, if the miracle did take place, a certain measure of authority, more or less, surely must thereby

attach to St. Ambrose, to his doctrine and his life, to his ecclesiastical principles and proceedings, to the Church itself of the fourth century, of which he is one main pillar.

“The miracle gives a certain sanction to three things at once: to the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to the Church’s resistance of the civil power, and to the commemoration of saints and martyrs. Which alternative shall the Protestant accept? shall we retreat, or shall we advance? shall we relapse into scepticism upon all subjects, or sacrifice our deep-rooted prejudices? shall we give up our knowledge of times past altogether, or endure to gain a knowledge which we think we fully have already—the knowledge of divine truth?”

The second is the conclusion of the entire volume.

“‘It may not be out of place to append to this passage of St. Martin’s history an account of one of his visions, which seems in various ways to be illustrative or even mythical of much in it. While Martin was praying in his cell, the evil spirit stood before him, enveloped in a glittering radiance, by such pretence more easily to deceive him; clad also in royal robes, crowned with a golden and jewelled diadem, with shoes covered with gold, with serene face and bright looks, so as to seem nothing so little as what he was.

“‘Martin at first was dazzled at the sight; and for a long while both parties kept silence. At length the evil one began: ‘Acknowledge,’ he says, ‘O Martin, whom thou seest; I am Christ; I am now descending upon earth, and I wished first to manifest myself to thee.’ Martin kept still silent, and returned no answer. The devil ventured to repeat his bold pretence: ‘Martin, why hesitate in believing, when thou seest I am Christ?’ Then he, understanding by revelation of the Spirit that it was the evil one, and not God, answered: ‘Jesus the Lord announced not that He should come in glittering clothing, and radiant with a diadem. I will not believe that Christ is come save in that state and form in which He suffered, save with the shew of the wounds and the cross.’ At these words the other vanished forthwith as smoke, and filled the cell with so horrible an odour as to leave indubitable proof who he was. That this so took place I know from the mouth of St. Martin himself, lest any one should think it fabulous.’

“The application of this vision to Martin’s age is obvious; I suppose it means in this day that Christ comes not in the pride of intellect or reputation for ability. These are the glittering robes in which Satan is now arraying. Many spirits are abroad, more are issuing from the pit; the credentials they display are the precious gifts of mind, beauty, riches, depth,

originality. Christian, look hard at them with Martin in silence, and then ask for the print of the nails!"

The Church of the Fathers was not, however, the author's first work on the early Christian ages. In 1832 he had written, and in 1833 had published, his *Arians of the Fourth Century*. This book, which is partly dogmatical, partly controversial, and partly historical, furnished decisive indications of the bent of the writer's mind. Notwithstanding its incidental Anglicanisms, it placed in startling contrast the Christian Church of early times with the Establishment which it was Mr. Newman's aim to vivify with Catholic faith. We have always regarded the *Arians of the Fourth Century* as one of his ablest works; and it is impossible to read it without anticipating the time when the same hand would pen the lecture from which we have quoted, and lay all its learning at the feet of the glorious saints whose deeds it had early commemorated, in these striking words:

"I soon found it to follow, that the grounds on which alone Anglicanism was defensible formed an impregnable stronghold for the primitive heresies, and that the justification of the primitive Councils was as cogent an apology for the Council of Trent. Without going into the question here, which would be out of place, it was difficult to make out how the Eutychians or Monophysites were heretics, unless Protestants and Anglicans were heretics also; difficult to find arguments against the Tridentine Fathers which did not tell against the Fathers of Chalcedon; difficult to condemn the Popes of the sixteenth century without condemning the Popes of the fifth. The drama of religion, and the combat of truth and error, were ever one and the same. The principles and proceedings of the Church now were those of the Church then; the principles and proceedings of heretics then were those of Protestants now. I found it so, almost fearfully; there was an awful similitude, more awful because so silent and unimpassioned, between the dead records of the past and the feverish chronicle of the present. The shadow of the fifth century was on the sixteenth. It was like a spirit rising from the troubled waters of the old world with the shape and lineaments of the new. The Church then, as now, might be called peremptory and stern, resolute, overbearing, and relentless; and heretics were shifting, changeable, reserved, and deceitful, ever courting the civil power, and never agreeing together except by its aid; and the civil power was ever aiming at comprehensions, trying to put the invisible out of view, and to substitute expediency for faith. What was the use of continuing the controversy, or defending my position, if, after all, I was but forging arguments for Arius or Eutyches, and turning devil's advocate against the much-enduring Athanasius and the majestic Leo? Be my soul with the saints! and shall I lift up my hand against them? Sooner may my right

hand forget her cunning, and wither outright, as his who once stretched it out against a prophet of God! perish sooner a whole tribe of Cranmers, Riddleys, Latimers, and Jewels! perish the names of Bramhall, Ussher, Taylor, Stillingfleet, and Barrow, from the face of the earth, ere I should do aught but fall at their feet in love and in worship, whose image was continually before my eyes, and whose musical words were ever in my ears and on my tongue!"

The second volume of the Tracts, published successively in 1834-35, displayed a decided advance onwards. Still applauding and reproducing the correct mediocrities of "Anglo-Catholic" divinity, and exalting the wisdom of the Prayer-book, it put forth two startling features; Dr. Pusey's long, elaborate, learned, and partly incomprehensible "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism" did for one sacrament what a tract on the ancient Catholic Liturgies did for another. If the common Protestant belief respecting Baptism was shewn to be clearly unscriptural and uncatholic, the Church of England Communion Office was as clearly proved to be a novelty in the Christian Church. The substance of the tract on Ancient Liturgies had already been made familiar to studious Anglicans by Mr. Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, a book of considerable learning. The *argument* to be derived from these Liturgies was now forcibly put forth, and English Protestants were compelled to see that whereas *every* ancient Christian Church was agreed in certain details of the eucharistic rite, the Communion Office of the Church of England was defective in the *most* important of all these particulars. For the first time distressed and pious clergymen were taught as follows:

"The four original forms"—(of which the Roman Mass is one)—"from which all the Liturgies in the world have been taken, resemble one another too much to have grown up independently, and too little to have been copied from one another."

And therefore, it was argued, they must all have proceeded from one source, namely, the Apostles themselves. And then the Tract continued:

"On a comparison of the different forms of oblation and consecration, it will be seen that in each of the four original Liturgies the Eucharist is regarded *as a mystery and a sacrifice*."

And therefore again, it was *implied* that the English Reformers, who treated the Eucharist as neither mystery nor sacrifice, had destroyed the work of the Apostles. All that the Tract *said*, indeed, was this cautious hint:

"Such is the view taken of the consecration and oblation

of the Eucharist in the four independent Christian Liturgies. *It is well worth the consideration of such Protestant bodies as have rejected the ancient forms."*

The impression produced by these oracular ambiguities was naturally slight, in comparison with the effect of Dr. Pusey's tract on Baptism. Lengthy, complicated, and overloaded with quotations, while few grasped the whole of the writer's meaning, or even gave him credit for having any complete and distinct meaning to communicate, this essay made it clear to every unprejudiced mind, that if the Bible is to be trusted, Baptism unquestionably conveys some ineffable spiritual gift to the soul, to be obtained in no other way, and the permanent loss of which entails eternal damnation. That Dr. Pusey ever thoroughly comprehended the Catholic doctrine which he professed to uphold, is rendered still more doubtful by the part he has taken in the recent dispute between the Bishop of Exeter and Mr. Gorham. Be this as it may, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration became henceforth the chief battle-ground between the new school and their adversaries. All Oxford rushed to hear the Regius Professor of Hebrew, whensoever his turn came round to preach before the University. Many of our readers can well picture to themselves the remarkable sight which the cathedral of Christ Church then presented, and the extraordinary impression wrought by those intensely earnest sermons. Pale with watching, reading, fasting, and sickness, a thin, melancholy, and austere yet gentle preacher astounded his self-satisfied listeners, by asserting that it was almost impossible that mortal sin after baptism could be forgiven. Painful from their preternaturally solemn delivery, obscure in their dogmatic definitions, and for the most part consisting of a series of interminable antitheses, these sermons nevertheless struck home to the heart of many a luxurious, or idle, or Evangelical college-fellow or undergraduate; and from that period the asceticism of the Oxford school was palpably on the increase. Who was there in those shadowy cloisters and venerable chapels, whose heart could endure the searching probe, or rest satisfied in the knowledge that it had preserved its baptismal innocence unsullied? Heads of colleges might frown, tutors might discourage, common-room gossip and periodical controversy might sneer and argue; but there was something in Dr. Pusey's manner, and his known personal austerities, and the courageous tone of his speech, which pierced the conscience with a sense of sin, and prepared it to yearn for the absolution of a priest.

The practically Catholic influence of Dr. Pusey's occasional

sermons was, notwithstanding, extremely small in comparison with that of another preacher now becoming notorious both in and out of Oxford. Mr. Newman, as vicar of St. Mary's, had in his hands an instrument for the propagation of the new doctrines, which he wielded with singular power and success. In the heart of the city of Oxford rises a majestic spire, one of the master-pieces of the fourteenth century. Beneath its clustering pinnacles is spread out a wide and lofty church, with a deep chancel and capacious nave. The latter forms what is called the "University Church," the building being at the same time the parochial church of the old parish of "St. Mary the Virgin." The University makes use of it chiefly for the preaching of sermons on Sundays and Saints' days. Prayers are said in all the separate colleges at an early hour in the morning, and in the course of the day two preachers, one in the forenoon, the other in the afternoon, preach before the vice-chancellor and other dignitaries, and the general body of the University. At the given hour the organ strikes up, a procession winds into the church, brilliant with gilded maces, black and scarlet gowns, crimson hoods, velvet sleeves and ermine; a single individual disengages himself from the rest, and while they take their appointed places in all the dignity of Oxford precision, he mounts the pulpit. A psalm is sung by a choir; the undergraduates in the galleries, the masters of arts below, and the "Dons" in their seats of honour, stand up and perform that peculiar Anglican ceremony which consists in burying the face in one's hat or cap for devotional purposes. The preacher pronounces what is termed the "bidding prayer," requesting the congregation to "pray for the whole estate of Christ's holy Catholic Church, *especially that pure and apostolic branch of it established in these realms*," enumerating various classes of persons, and naming especially with honour—but not for prayer—the founder of his own college (generally a Catholic). Then he concludes with the Lord's Prayer, and proceeds with his sermon. This, of course, is indescribable. In the course of a single year, as there are nearly as many different preachers as sermons preached, every conceivable shade of heresy may be heard formally stated, or unconsciously blundered into, in that pulpit of many tongues. It is the Babel of modern days. *Tot homines, quot sententiæ*. In the morning (the period being that of which we are chiefly speaking) the Fathers are upheld, in the afternoon they are ridiculed; to-day baptismal regeneration is preached, next Sunday we are taught the Lutheran "justification by faith only;" a "select preacher" eulogises the *Tracts for the Times*, and is followed by a country parson, who broadly hints that

Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey are disguised Jesuits; and the "Bampton Lecturer" for the year expounds some systematic view or crotchet of his own, which if not the most flagrantly heretical, is probably the most irresistibly somniferous of all the heretical and somniferous topics to which this celebrated pulpit gives birth.

St. Mary's is, however, a parish church as well as the University church; and it was the possession of its pulpit, after the University sermons were ended, that enabled its vicar to inculcate the Tractarian views, not in dry dogmatic tracts, but in connexion with the daily realities of a practical religious life. And for several consecutive years, the sight of those concluding services was of infinitely greater interest than the pompous celebrations and discourses which the University delighted in. A few straggling tradespeople and maid-servants were the bulk of the parochial congregation, properly so called, for Mr. Newman's preaching was never popular with the non-academic inhabitants of Oxford; but scattered thickly throughout the church were seen a crowd of black-gowned listeners, young and middle-aged, and sometimes, though rarely, old, who thronged to hear the clear, even, earnest, and monotonous voice of one whose whole soul was in every word he uttered; and who, with whatever errors or gradual changes he displayed, was manifestly possessed with the ideas of God, of sin, of death, of judgment, and of eternity. Very many of these sermons were published, as time went on, in successive volumes; and it cannot be doubted that they have done more to save men's souls, by bringing them ultimately into the Catholic Church, than any other of the instruments which the movement of 1833 has had at its command. For the most part uncontroversial, they enforced, first of all, practical religion, in terms at once in harmony with the language of the Bible, and free from the unreal phraseology of common Protestant preachers. By degrees they grew more decidedly doctrinal and more prominently Catholic, as the mind of the preacher himself advanced, and his hearers were prepared for strong meat instead of milk. After a while, the old High-Church school began to frown and mutter. College authorities warned their pupils against Mr. Newman's subtleties; and even such petty devices were resorted to as the alteration of the dinner-hour, in order to compel the undergraduates to give up either their meals or the sermons. Still they were preached, listened to, published, read, and *acted on*; and at this hour there are hundreds of persons now Catholics who attribute their ultimate conversion, under Divine grace, to the practical influence of these sermons upon their inward hearts

and outward lives. Certain it is, that there are but few passages in the whole series of the published volumes which are contrary to Catholic doctrine and morals, and a slight expurgation leaves them (though, of course, frequently defective, yet) perfectly free from all positive evil. It is remarkable also, as a further illustration of what we have stated respecting the early tendency of some of the Tract-writers toward the Catholic Church, that many of Mr. Newman's published sermons were preached two or three years, and some of them as much as eight or nine years, before the Tracts began. He was inducted as vicar of St. Mary's in the year 1828.

But it was not alone from the pulpit of St. Mary's that the movement gathered strength and spread. Shut out from the nave by a solid screen, surmounted by a lofty organ, the venerable chancel of the church was scarcely known to the ordinary attendant at the University sermons. The wandering eye indeed caught a glimpse of an antique roof, of dingy walls, and of windows dim with green and decaying glass; and if some thoughtful mind ever pondered over the difference between its neglected shade and the cold precision and dreary smartness of the restored nave, it could only account for the distinction by reflecting that an *altar* was no longer necessary to University celebrations. Yet, as days went on, it was within that forgotten chancel that the truest tokens were to be gathered of the real life and energy of the rising school. Singular and repelling as the services there celebrated must have appeared to the true Catholic; cold, formal, and austere, as was the aspect of the greater number of those who there, from Sunday to Sunday—and fasting—received what they would fain convince themselves was the body and blood of Jesus Christ, it was impossible not to recognise in those unpretending and quiet gatherings a token of the genuineness and self-sacrificing sincerity of the ever-increasing supporters of "Anglo-Catholicism." No fond displays of Unanglican show, no apings of Catholic rites, betrayed unreality of mind, or fickleness of heart. Week after week, and year after year, in sunshine and in storm, a body of men availed themselves of the weekly Communion, which could be found there alone in all Oxford; while the occasional princely gifts to the purposes of their church, which were given at their offertory, attested their superiority to the mammon-worship of their country. These and other such acts were a pledge of the sincerity of many among the earliest followers of the movement, which shewed where they must end, unless they would return to the darkness from which they were emerging. Very

beautifully has Father Newman himself described these times in the Lectures before us :

“ Why should I deny,” he says, speaking to those who, from the sincerity of Anglo-Catholics, would argue the truth of Anglo-Catholicism,—“ why should I deny to your memory what is so pleasant in mine? Cannot I too look back on many years past, and many events, in which I myself experienced what is now your confidence? Can I forget the happy life I have led all my days, with no cares, no anxieties worth remembering, without desolateness or fever of thought, or gloom of mind, or doubt of God’s love to me and providence over me? Can I forget,—I never can forget, the day when in my youth I first bound myself to the ministry of God in that old church of St. Frideswide, the patroness of Oxford. Nor how I wept most abundant and most sweet tears, when I thought what I then had become : though I looked on it then as no sacramental rite, nor even to baptism ascribed any supernatural virtue. Can I wipe out from my memory, or wish to wipe out, those happy Sunday mornings, light or dark, year after year, when I celebrated your communion-rite in my own church of St. Mary’s ; and in the pleasantness and joy of it, heard nothing of the strife of tongues which surrounded its walls ?”

While sermons, tracts, and historical essays, were thus opening their heavy fire upon the bulwarks of Protestantism, a lighter species of artillery began to play upon the beleaguered citadel. The age of Anglo-Catholic story-books and newspaper articles was not yet come ; the genius of Oxford was for awhile too fastidious for aught so secular and common. Versification was the only device to which it could stoop, and accordingly a series of short poems appeared from time to time in the *British Magazine*, entitled *Lyra Apostolica*, which were afterwards collected and published in a single volume. These poems were extremely unequal, both in matter and versification. Some were unmistakeably and incurably Anglican in their tone ; others betrayed at once a yearning towards Rome, a thoughtful but half-informed habit of meditation on her character, united with a mingled horror and fear. Some were personal in subject, some devotional and general, some laboriously patristic and repulsively grotesque. Taken as a whole, there was no mistaking the true meaning of the dominant spirit of the publication. Its most prolific contributor, besides another writer whose stanzas possessed a more than usual and classic grace, were clearly not standing still, but on the road *somewhere*. The motto of the Tracts from the first had been, “ If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle ?” and now it appeared as if they who blew the blast had caught some strange respon-

sive sound, no mere echo of their own notes, but more musical, more mysterious, and coming forth from some hidden fount of harmony. Wondering at the melody, and distrusting their own courageous tones, they seem now to be answering the unknown voice in strains betokening at once their fears, their hopes, and their love. Interpreted by the aid of events that have since come to pass, the significance of many of the poems in the *Lyra* is great indeed. For the sake of their significance, as well as for their intrinsic beauty, we shall quote a few of their most remarkable passages. Already Oxford scrupled not to publish such a faith in the *Sign of the Cross* as the following lines express :

“ Whene’er across this sinful flesh of mine
 I draw the holy sign,
 All good thoughts stir within me, and collect
 Their slumbering strength divine,
 Till there springs up that hope of God’s elect
 My faith shall not be wreck’d.

And who shall say, but hateful spirits around,
 For their brief hour unbound,
 Shudder to see, and wail their overthrow ?
 While on far heathen ground
 Some lonely saint hails the fresh odour, though
 Its source he cannot know ?”

What a singular homage is paid in the subjoined stanzas to the mysterious power of Rome to win and command the heart, even while the ignorance of heresy and schism would close up its portals to the charmer’s voice !

“ THE GOOD SAMARITAN.

“ Oh that thy creed were sound !
 For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
 By thy unwearied watch and varied round
 Of service in thy Saviour’s holy home.
 I cannot walk the city’s sultry streets
 But the wide porch invites to still retreats,
 Where passion’s thirst is calm’d, and care’s unthankful gloom.

There on a foreign shore
 The homesick solitary finds a friend :
 Thoughts, prison’d long for lack of speech, outpour
 Their tears ; and doubts in resignation end.
 I almost fainted from the long delay
 That tangles me within this languid bay,
 When comes a foe, my wounds with oil and wine to tend.”

Of the more personal of the verses, the next we quote are among the best, on the text,

"Thou in faithfulness hast afflicted me."

"Lord, in this dust thy sovereign voice
First quicken'd love divine ;
I am all Thine,—thy care and choice,—
My very praise is thine.

I praise Thee, while thy Providence
In childhood frail I trace,
For blessings given, ere dawning sense
Could seek or scan thy grace ;

Blessings in boyhood's marvelling hour,
Bright dreams and fancyings strange ;
Blessings, when reason's awful power
Gave thought a bolder range ;

Blessings of friends, which to my door
Unasked, unhop'd, have come ;
And, choicer still, a countless store
Of eager smiles at home.

Yet, Lord, in memory's fondest place
I shrine those seasons sad,
When, looking up, I saw thy face
In kind austereness clad.

I would not miss one sigh or tear,
Heart-pang, or throbbing brow ;
Sweet was the chastisement severe,
And sweet its memory now.

Yes ! let the fragrant scars abide,
Grace-tokens in thy stead,
Faint shadows of the spear-pierced side,
And thorn-encompass'd head.

And such thy loving force be still,
Mid life's fierce shifting fray,
Shaping to truth self's froward will
Along thy narrow way.

Deny me wealth ; far, far remove
The lure of power or name ;
Hope thrives in straits, in weakness Love,
And Faith in this world's shame."

One more of these poems is worth extracting, as shewing how early the writer had marked that peculiar facility enjoyed

by Catholics of passing from secular to spiritual subjects, and even from laughter to prayer, which is so inexplicable a phenomenon to the impotent Protestant, with whom devotion is generally so painful a toil. It deserves quoting, further, as an introduction to one of the most admirable passages in F. Newman's recent Lectures, in which we see how what was at once a mystery and a scandal to him in 1833 is in 1850 a natural result of a living faith. The extract from the Lectures suffers, indeed, from the absence of its context, which is one of the most masterly of all the masterly passages in the whole volume; but even as it stands it is sufficiently striking and illustrative of our present point. In the *Lyra Apostolica* the traveller thus sings:

“Once cast with men of language strange
And foreign-moulded creed,
I mark'd their random converse change,
And sacred themes succeed.

Oh, how I coveted the gift
To thread their mingled throng
Of sounds; then high my witness lift;
But weakness chain'd my tongue.

Lord! has our dearth of faith and prayer
Lost us this power once given,
Or is it sent at seasons rare,
And then flits back to heaven?”

In the *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties* the Oratorian Father thus preaches. He *has* found a gift of tongues, though not that for which once he burned. The Pentecostal fire has descended again from heaven, but it has been to lighten him and his much-loved friends to the feet of that very Church of Rome at whose incomprehensible lineaments they had so long gazed from afar.

“You enter into one of the churches close upon the scene of festivity, and you turn your eyes to a confessional. The penitents are crowding for admission, and they seem to have no shame or solemnity or reserve about the errand on which they are come; till at length, on a penitent's turning from the grate, one tall woman, bolder than a score of men, darts forward from a distance into the place he has vacated, to the disappointment of the many who have waited longer than she. You almost groan under the weight of your imagination that such a soul, so selfish, so unrecollected, must surely be in very ill dispositions for so awful a sacrament. You look at the priest, and he has on his face a look almost of impatience, or of good-natured compassion, at the voluble and superfluous matter which is the staple of her confession. The priests, you think, are

no better than the people. My dear brethren, be not so uncharitable, so unphilosophical. Things we thoroughly believe, things we see, things which occur to us every day, we treat as things which *do* occur and *are* seen daily, be they of this world or be they of the next. Even Bishop Butler should have taught you that 'practical habits are strengthened by repeated acts, and passive impressions grow weaker by being repeated upon us.' It is not by frames of mind, it is not by emotions, that we must judge of real religion; it is the having a will and a heart set towards those things unseen; and, though impatience and rudeness are to be subdued, and are faulty even in their minutest exhibitions, yet do not argue from them the absence of faith, nor yet of love or of contrition. You turn away half satisfied, and what do you see? There is a feeble old woman, who first genuflects before the Blessed Sacrament, and then steals her neighbour's handkerchief or prayer-book, who is intent on his devotions. Here at last, you say, is a thing absolutely indefensible and inexcusable. Doubtless; but what does it prove? Does England bear no thieves? or do you think this poor creature an unbeliever? or do you exclaim against Catholicism, which has made her so profane? But why? Faith is illuminative, not operative. It does not force obedience, though it increases responsibility; it heightens guilt, it does not prevent sin. The will is the source of action, not an influence from without, acting mechanically on the feelings. She worships and she sins; she kneels because she believes, she steals because she does not love; she may be out of God's grace, she is not altogether out of his sight.

"You come out again and mix in the idle and dissipated throng, and you fall in with a man in a palmer's dress selling false relics, and a credulous circle of customers buying them as greedily as though they were the supposed French laces and India silks of a pedlar's basket. One simple soul has bought of him a cure for the rheumatism or ague, which might form a case of conscience. It is said to be a relic of St. Cuthbert, but only has virtue at sunrise, and when applied with three crosses to the head, arms, and feet. You pass on, and encounter a rude son of the Church, more like a showman than a religious, recounting to the gaping multitude some tale of a vision of the invisible world, seen by Brother Augustine of the Friar Minors, or by a holy Jesuit preacher who died in the odour of sanctity, and sending round his bag to collect pence for the souls in purgatory; and of some appearance of our Lady (the like of which has really been before and since), but on no authority except popular report, and in no shape but that which popular caprice has given it. You go forward, and you find preparations proceeding for a great pageant or mystery; it is a high festival, and the incorporated trades have each undertaken their special religious celebration. The plumbers and glaziers are to play the Creation; the barbers the Call of Abraham; and at night is to be the grandest performance of all, the Resurrection and Last Judgment, played by the carpenters, masons, and blacksmiths. Heaven and hell are represented,—

saints, devils, and living men; and the *chef d'œuvre* of the exhibition is the display of fireworks to be let off as the *finale*. 'How unutterably profane!' again you cry. Yes, profane to you, my dear brother,—profane to a population which only half believes; not profane to those who believe wholly, who, one and all, have a vision within, which corresponds with what they see, which resolves itself into, or rather takes up into itself, the external pageant, whatever be the moral condition of each individual composing the mass. They gaze, and in drinking in the exhibition with their eyes they are making one continuous and intense act of faith.

"You turn to go home, and, in your way, you pass through a retired quarter of the city. Look up at those sacred windows; they belong to the convent of the Perpetual Adoration, or to the poor Clares, or to the Carmelites of the reform of St. Theresa, or to the nuns of the Visitation. Seclusion, silence, watching, adoration, is their life day and night. The immaculate Lamb of God is ever before the eyes of the worshippers; or at least the invisible mysteries of faith ever stand out, as if in bodily shape, before their mental gaze. Where will you find such a realised heaven upon earth? Yet that very sight has acted otherwise on the mind of a weak sister; and the very keenness of her faith, and wild desire of approaching the object of it, has led her to fancy or to feign that she has received that singular favour vouchsafed only to a few elect souls; and she points to God's wounds, as imprinted on her hands and feet and side, though she herself has been instrumental in their formation.

"In these and a thousand other ways it may be shewn, that that special character of a Catholic country, which offends you, my brethren, so much, that mixture of seriousness and levity, that familiar handling of sacred things in word and deed, by good and bad, that publication of religious thoughts and practices, so far as it is found, is the necessary consequence of its being Catholic. It is the consequence of mixed multitudes all having faith; for faith impresses the mind with supernatural truths, as if it were sight, and the faith of this man and the faith of that is one and the same, and creates one and the same impression. The truths of religion then stand in the place of facts, and public ones. Sin does not obliterate the impression; and did it begin to do so in particular cases, the consistent testimony of all around would bring back the mind to itself, and prevent the incipient evil. Ordinarily speaking, once faith, always faith. Eyes once opened to good, as to evil, are not closed again; and if men reject the truth, it is, in most cases, a question whether they have ever possessed it. It is just the reverse among a Protestant people: private judgment does but create opinions, and nothing more; and these opinions are peculiar to each individual, and different from those of any one else. Hence it leads men to keep their feelings to themselves, because the avowal of them only causes irritation or ridicule in others. Since, too, they have no certainty of the doctrines they profess, they do but feel that they ought to be-

lieve them, and they try to believe them, and they nurse the offspring of their reason as a sickly child, bringing it out of doors only on fine days. They feel very clear and quite satisfied while they are very still; but if they turn about their head, or change their posture ever so little, the vision of the Unseen, like a mirage, is gone from them. So they keep the exhibition of their faith for high days and great occasions, when it comes forth with sufficient pomp, and gravity of language, and ceremonial of manner. Truths slowly totter out with Scripture texts at their elbow, as unable to walk alone. Moreover, they know, if such and such things *be* true, what *ought* to be the voice, the tone, the gesture, and the carriage attendant upon them; thus reason, which is the substance of their faith, supplies the rubrics, as I may call them, of their behaviour. This, some of you, my brethren, call reverence, though, I am obliged to say, it is as much a mannerism, and an unpleasant mannerism, as that of the Evangelical party, which they have hitherto condemned. They condemn Catholics because, however religious, they are natural, unaffected, easy, and cheerful in their mention of sacred things; and they think themselves never so real as when they are solemn."

But we recur to the course of events as time gave them birth.

In 1835 a step was taken which, though its effects were not great, and its rumour did not spread throughout the country, was a sufficient indication of the increasing progress of the movement, and of the organised character it was rapidly assuming. A theological society (a portent in English Established Protestantism) was formed in Oxford. This society was to be managed by a committee, in which it was proposed to include the two Oxford Professors of Divinity, Mr. E. Greswell (a learned theological critic), Mr. Palmer (before spoken of), together with Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and Mr. Oakeley, of Balliol College. The first four were in no sense really connected with the leaders in the Tract movement; but as the latter were still firm in their conviction that they were rapidly carrying out the *true* principles of the Establishment, these others were, in all good faith, requested to join in the scheme. As it turned out, they would have nothing to do with any thing so perilous and novel; but Anglo-Catholicism was already strong enough to do without them. The meetings, which lasted some time, were held once a fortnight at Dr. Pusey's rooms; and theological essays, developing Anglo-Catholic principles, for the most part in the direction of Rome, were read to crowded and attentive audiences of bachelors and masters of arts. The esoteric character of the proceedings gave a zest to the whole affair, which, nevertheless, was somewhat dimi-

nished by the prohibition of the discussions which at the beginning were both permitted and encouraged.

The first of a long series of University struggles now impended, and the names of the "Tractarians" began to be seen in the common newspapers of the day. For the first time (and for this time only in conjunction with Evangelicalism and Establishmentarianism) Puseyism met the civil power of the State in a hand-to-hand conflict. In this its first contest it partly won the day; for it can scarcely be doubted that if the names of Pusey and Newman had not been found in the list of the opponents of Dr. Hampden, he would have crushed his opponents of every lower grade. The Whigs were in office; but office had not quenched the fires of their University-reforming zeal. Vague ideas of conciliating the Dissenters, united with their hereditary hostility to the High-Church Toryism of Oxford, prompted them to utter many threats of fundamental change. The Thirty-nine Articles, not yet discovered to be the dead weight upon the progress of Anglo-Catholicism, were marked out by the political and latitudinarian reformers for formal rejection as University tests. Dissenters hoped to be admitted to the venerable halls whence Cranmer and Ridley had ejected the children of Wykeham and Waynflete, not for the behoof of Anglicanism in particular, but for the behoof of nationalism in general. For common sense, that bitter foe of Oxford exclusiveness, was now loudly murmuring that, as the Thirty-nine Articles had ceased to be the sole symbol of the national faith, it was sheer tyranny to retain them as a test in national seminaries. The civil power, originally Catholic, when it constituted itself Anglican, had seized the Universities, and made them Anglican also. Now, it was very logically argued, the civil power having constituted itself latitudinarian, the Universities must follow the "progress of the national mind," and the Thirty-nine Articles must go the way of all other Acts of Parliament. A war of words, spoken and written, ensued, in which much was uttered and little done. On the whole, victory seemed to be with the Conservatives; but they only dammed up the flood, which poured over their feeble barriers with increased velocity and power.

Irritated, doubtless, by the contumacious resistance of the dominant parties in Oxford, in 1836 the Whig Government struck them a blow where they least anticipated a wound. Early in that year Dr. Burton, the Regius Professor of Divinity, died. His professorship, as its name implies, was of royal foundation; and the chief source of its large revenues

arose from the canonry of Christ's Church, which was attached to the professorship. Until this memorable year the professorship had been sacred ground. No foot of Whig, or Low-Churchman, or Evangelical, or Latitudinarian, had polluted it. Its chair was the very oracle of the *safe* school,—that school which British authority, as such, ever most loves to cherish. The deceased professor was not unworthy of his vocation. Learned in his degree, amiable, respectable, dignified, with a due sense of the royal supremacy (even when the monarch was a Whig), Dr. Burton had creditably performed his duties; and though he had mildly insinuated the expediency of Church Reform, was regarded with not insincere respect by most men of any weight in the University.

At length he died; and Oxford was transfixed by an announcement that Dr. Hampden was to be appointed by Lord Melbourne to the vacant post. Of all men in the University Dr. Hampden was the most unacceptable to the Anglo-Catholics. In 1832 he had preached the "Bampton Lectures," an annual series of sermons, of which the usual result is the demonstration of the incapacity or the heresy of the preacher. In Dr. Hampden's case the latter was the result. A latitudinarian to an extent unparalleled in Oxford, he had attributed the Christian faith in the efficacy of the sacraments to the belief in magic of the middle ages; dogmatic statements generally he viewed as scholastic refinements, always perilous, and often mischievous; and altogether he had avowed opinions which were regarded, and justly, as tantamount, *in principle*, to Socinianism.

Oxford, however, was in a false position. Appointed to preach the Bampton Lectures by the usual *safe* authorities, the lecturer's heresies had been passed over *sub silentio* by all but a few sensitive and discerning minds. Dull and ungainly in style, and treating of subjects far removed from the ordinary gossip of the common room and the lucubrations of the heads of houses, his sermons had attracted few hearers, and when afterwards published found still fewer readers. Subsequently to their delivery he had been appointed by the Chancellor to the headship of St. Mary Hall; and in 1834, the most orthodox University, by its Vice-chancellor and proctors, and the heads of three of its chief colleges, nominated the Doctor to a professorship of moral philosophy, as being (in the words of the founder's declaration), "recommended by his soundness of religion,—*religionis sinceritate commendatus*." In the same year Dr. Hampden had, further, come forward on the side of the Dissenters. He wrote a pamphlet avowing in the clearest terms his hatred of the dogmatic principle. The authorities, how-

ever, had taken no steps to cancel the marks of their approbation which they had bestowed upon him; and when the prime minister selected him for the Divinity professorship, he must little have anticipated the storm of indignation he was about to evoke. Doubtless, Lord Melbourne solely intended the appointment as a blow at Oxford exclusiveness, and as a reward for Dr. Hampden's pamphlet in favour of the admission of Dissenters.

Nevertheless, a tempest instantly arose, which, we think, was mainly owing to the blowing of the breath of Tractarianism. Already the movement had forced upon many minds a vivid conviction of the truth of the dogmatic principle, and a dislike of Dissenters, not as nonconformists, but as heretics. To speak against sacramental grace they accounted a species of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; and armed with new-found doctrinal acuteness, they detected and displayed the latent enormities of the Bampton Lectures, till the safe men shrugged their shoulders, and the Evangelicals believed that Lutheranism itself was in danger. Pamphlets swarmed throughout the country; letters innumerable deluged the periodicals; the common secular newspapers took up the strain, and contributed to bring Oxford and its new school prominently before the public eye. Extracts were selected from the professor's writings, and circulated in every quarter; and Establishmentarian Protestantism awoke and found itself burning with zeal for the Athanasian Creed and the doctrine of sacramental efficacy.

The moving power in the agitation consisted of a small committee in Oxford, who had constituted themselves guardians of Anglican orthodoxy against a hostile premier, a questionable prelacy, and a vacillating board of heads of houses. This committee was ingeniously composed of representatives of various schools, so that Tractarianism should not *appear* to be taking the lead in the movement. The Rev. Vaughan Thomas and the Rev. Edward Greswell together represented the High and Dry and the Safe and Learned schools; the Rev. John Hill represented the Evangelicals; the Rev. John Henry Newman and the Rev. Dr. Pusey represented the Anglo-Catholics; and the Rev. William Sewell represented himself. These six prepared addresses, devised plans, issued circulars, and treated with the heads of houses. For, as we have stated, the supreme authorities in Oxford were unwilling to take any severe measures in reprobation of Dr. Hampden's heresies. Apart from their usual indifference to theological subtleties, as they considered them, they were loath to stultify themselves, and brand as a heretic the man

they had recently chosen as a professor of morals. The committee desired a solemn University condemnation of Dr. Hampden's doctrines. The Board of College Superiors, with whom every University act must originate, would tolerate nothing of the kind. The professor meanwhile refused to retract a single line that he had written; and at length a compromise of the shabbiest character was effected. The heads consented to censure the *man*, while they left his *heresies* untouched. Dr. Hampden was disqualified by Convocation from filling certain University offices; but he remained at liberty, as Professor of Divinity, to teach whatsoever doctrines he pleased! Such was the triumph of orthodoxy in Oxford.

Meanwhile the *Tracts for the Times* continued their progress, and gained a large circulation. The brief, terse, suggestive, and cautious papers of the first volume were giving way to more elaborate and bolder doctrinal essays, shewing how the writers were silently working their way towards that Catholic Church against which they still wrote and repeated harsh and ignorant words. The third volume, for 1835-1836, contains six Tracts, some of them of remarkable interest. Prefixed to the volume was issued a republication of Dr. Pusey's answer to an anonymous and amusing pamphlet, purporting to be a *Pastoral Epistle from the Pope to certain Members of the University of Oxford*. This "Pastoral Epistle" was an ingenious squib, in which his Holiness was supposed to applaud the Jesuitical proceedings of the Tract-writers, and to bid them go on and prosper in their pious labours for converting England to the true faith. It was chiefly unfair to the Tractarians in that it almost imputed to them a consciousness that their doctrines must lead to Rome. In other respects the "Pastoral Epistle" was a very legitimate controversial weapon, while its delicate irony raised it far above the level of the vulgar Protestant assailants of the movement. Dr. Pusey, however, as was natural, thought the joke excessively profane. Unable to appreciate a jest, even on his own side, he was grievously scandalised, and printed an *Earnest Remonstrance* to the author of the "Epistle." His "Remonstrance" certainly was no jest; and the weapon of his adversary's wit was scarcely turned aside by the heavy armour he presented in his defence. A long and tedious collection of those extracts (which the Tract-writers brought into temporary vogue) was appended to the "Remonstrance," to shew how many Anglicans had held some vague notions or other in favour of Episcopacy, but which proved little more than the industry of certain Oxford men in searching for passages from forgotten books.

Very different were some of the remaining Tracts in the

volume. First came an essay, *No. I., against Romanism*. It presents a got-up case, shrinking from the real points at issue, but already giving tokens of the final pseudo-catholic phase which the movement assumed previous to its mortal blow in 1845. It was hinted, in no ambiguous terms, that Rome in theory might be right, and that it was only in her practice that she was wrong. This was the germ of Tract No. 90; and henceforth all the disclaimers of Popery which the Tractarians could put forth were powerless to blind the eyes of suspicious Protestantism. Then followed a republication of Archbishop Ussher's essay on *Prayers for the Dead*; of which the gist is, that prayers for the dead are lawful, but that either the dead do not really *need* them, or that they do not profit the dead at all.

Next to this model of controversial acuteness appeared a striking essay on two books which are probably unknown to our Catholic readers, but which, especially one of them, had attained a wonderful popularity in "the religious world" of the day. Erskine's *Internal Evidence of Christianity* and Jacob Abbott's *Corner-Stone* were the two works selected by Mr. Newman as a text wherefrom to lay bare the Infidel tendencies of Evangelical religionism. Erskine was a metaphysical Scotchman, substantially of the school of the German and French sceptics. His book was in principle identical with such speculations as Morell's *Philosophy of Religion*, Froude's *Nemesis of Faith*, Fox's *Lectures on the Religious Ideas*, and Francis Newman's *Phases of Faith*. He sought for our knowledge of Almighty God, of his will and of his actions, not in an external revelation communicated by Himself to man, but in the innermost recesses of the human intelligence. This intelligence he treated as the test of all truth, or rather as containing in itself the germ of all truth, human and (so called) divine. Not that these Evangelical unbelievers were prepared logically to carry out their system to its just issues. They *seemed* to talk a species of declaratory dogmatism, partly orthodox, partly Lutheran, partly sentimental. With all their rationalism, they clung, or thought they clung, to the doctrines of the atonement and of the natural corruption of human nature, as revealed by God. The poison yet worked subtly in their souls; and the extensive influence which such writers as Erskine acquired, stands in striking contrast with the undisguised horror with which open unbelief is even now viewed by the English world.

Abbott (who is still a popular writer of histories for the young) is an American. His *Corner-Stone* was a palpable piece of Socinianism. In truth, it spoke of our blessed Lord

in a tone from which many a professed Socinian would shrink with disgust and pain. Yet, because he employed a certain measure of "Evangelical" phraseology, the "Evangelicals" of the day were actually fascinated with his lively, simple, and practical pages. He viewed the Gospel as a *manifestation* of the moral character of Almighty God, and as nothing more. The death of our blessed Lord he treated as the impressive summing up of the sermon which his pious life had preached. The book, at the same time, was fresh and ingenious, and it entered into the moral details of the Christian life with a hearty vigour and a common sense which Lutherans and Calvinists found delightful, after the cloying monotony and unrealities of their most popular teachers. The *Corner-Stone* was the book of the "religious" community, until Mr. Newman's Tracts opened men's eyes, and even Evangelicals condescended to learn caution from his earnest warnings. This Tract is still well worthy of study by all who would trace the progress of modern Infidelity. Its author had, indeed, not yet come to see, that between the belief in an infallible living guide to the truths of revelation, and the belief that all revelation is really hidden in germ in the natural intelligence, there is but one step. Had Erskine or Abbott been equal to the controversy, they might have retorted upon the Anglo-Catholics, that the most ultrapatristic theory is in fact but a relegation of the rights of Almighty God to the critical faculty of man. The principle of the Tracts was as logically self-contradictory as that of the Evangelical infidels; and it was only because popular religionism is ever as shallow as it is audacious, that Mr. Newman's keen dissection of their tendencies was not answered by a challenge either to believe in Rome or to believe nothing.

The remainder of the third volume of the Tracts was chiefly occupied by an essay on the Roman Breviary, with long extracts from its offices, extending in all to more than 200 closely-printed pages. It is impossible to peruse the reasons given by the writer for his publication without a smile. With a charming simplicity and ignorance of grammar, he informed his fellow-Churchmen that "whatever is good and true in these devotions will be claimed, and on reasonable grounds, for the Church Catholic in opposition to the Roman Church, whose only real claim above other Churches is that of having, on the one hand, preserved the service with less of mutilation or abridgment, and, on the other, having adopted into it certain additions and novelties, ascertainable to be such in history, as well as being corruptions doctrinally." Thus, having told his readers that one of the *claims of Rome*

above other Churches consisted in her having introduced novelties and doctrinal corruptions into the ancient devotions, he went on to give divers reasons for the putting forth of his essay, based on the view that the Breviary belonged of right to the Established Church. Then followed a sketch of the history of the Breviary. In the course of this sketch it was assumed that because the dates of the composition of the four Antiphons to the Blessed Virgin could be stated or guessed at, *therefore* they embodied novelties in doctrine. Little remembering that on precisely this ground Latitudinarians reject the Athanasian Creed, the Nicene Creed, and in fact every dogmatic statement whatever, the Tract-writer proceeded to a critical analysis of the "hours," and even translations of considerable portions of the office for different days. In conjunction with these came a *new* office. A service in commemoration of the death of the Protestant Bishop Ken was compiled on the Catholic model, and recommended to the private use of Anglo-Catholics.

From the time of the publication of this Tract may be dated the rise of that fondness for "Roman" devotions, which still remains one of the tokens of the Tractarian school. On the fastidious Oxford student or college-fellow, the exquisite refinement and elaborate polish of the Breviary acted as a spell. Silently and slowly, a distaste for the mangled, declaiming ritual of the Book of Common Prayer worked its way in many a thoughtful and many a wayward mind. While the impudence of the "Office for Bishop Ken's day" was such as almost to command respect by its fearlessness, the beauties of the Catholic devotions, now for the first time made a subject of respectful study, acted upon religious Anglicans like the first glimpse of the promised land. Already that more frequent use of their own Prayer-book which the movement had fostered was producing a sense of weariness at the dull monotonous round. Men who would fain call their congregations together daily to prayer both morning and evening, grew faint beneath the pressure of Act-of-Parliament "exhortations" and "absolutions," and sighed for the spiritual grace and evangelic truth of the Breviary hours. A startling phenomenon was seen in Oxford by those privileged to witness its esoteric rites. Protestant clergymen adopted the rules of Catholic priests, and in whole or in part recited the Roman Breviary by way of private devotion. In small secret parties, or in solitary isolation, they said Matins, Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, and Compline; and accounted themselves to be carrying out the spirit of the Establishment the while. Some omitted what they deemed the

"novelties and corruptions" of the Breviary, and shrank from positively addressing our Blessed Lady with a direct invocation. Others, more courageous, more clear-sighted, or more wilful, recited a *Salve Regina* or an *Alma Redemptoris Mater* with a keener gusto, from a sense of the daring novelty of their proceedings. Some compiled an *Ordo recitandi Divini Officii* adapted to the "English Calendar," i.e. the Calendar in the Book of Common Prayer, and passed over all Saints' days not retained by "our venerable Reformers." Others, already hating the Reformation, and despising half-measures and caution, gloried in their Romanising, and loved no feasts so well as those which Protestantism most abhorred. All this, indeed, was a work of time. It was far from being the instantaneous result of the publication of the Tract on the Breviary, though it was already giving symptoms of its ultimate progress. At the same time, in its very infancy it was a token that the movement had completed its first stage, and was no longer what it had been at its commencement.

Concurrently with this marked advance of the more matured disciples of the Tracts, a sermon was preached and published by one of the chiefs, which tended powerfully to commend the movement to the more sober and "scriptural" members of the Church of England. *Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture* was the title of a sermon delivered by the Rev. John Keble, at a Visitation of Dr. Dealtry, in Winchester Cathedral, in September 1836. This discourse did for the Tractarian theory of Tradition what Dr. Pusey's essay had done for the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. It was made clear that the Bible recognised the existence of a certain unwritten deposit of religious doctrine, to be received by Christians as undoubtedly true. *What* that deposit might be, was a distinct consideration. No person who could read St. Paul's Epistles could deny that frequent reference was made to *some* traditional teaching. Whether Mr. Keble's deductions on the subject were true, or whether the Roman doctrine of Infallibility were true, it could no longer be asserted by men who professed to follow the Bible, that Tradition, as such, was unsanctioned by the Apostles. The leaders of the Evangelical party, of course, remained unconvinced. If *any* tradition was to be tolerated, there was an end of Lutheranism for ever; and with an unwonted acuteness, the organs and preachers of Lutheranism warned the public that it was logically impossible to believe in *any* tradition and stop short of Rome. This, however, neither Mr. Keble nor his friends and followers could see. They had a theory that the Apostolic Traditions were to be sought for by

historical criticism. The rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, was proclaimed as their touchstone. In a happy ignorance of the true bearings of that famous test, they rested satisfied that while it condemned Romanism, it would uphold Anglicanism; and, in the fullest good faith, they continued to teach the authority of tradition and the corruptions of Rome.

This sermon had a very considerable sale. The respected name of its author, its quiet, unoffending tone, its freedom from all "Romanising" spirit or phraseology, and the undeniable truth of some of its propositions, all combined to give it a striking influence on the popular mind. A generation already sufficiently bewildered by the contradictions of controversy and the difficulties of the Scripture text was but too ready to embrace any *apparent* solution of its perplexities. "Here is the clue," it was said, and it was believed. "Let us go to the Fathers; let us open the epistles of Ignatius and Clement; let us read Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Ambrose; let us ascertain what St. Paul taught by the same process through which we ascertain what Julius Cæsar did; let us ask what the Council of Nice declared to be the Apostolic faith, just as we now go to the twelve judges to learn what is the constitutional law of England." Whether it was safe to assume that *every thing* which the Apostles taught was to be found written in the books of the Fathers, was a question into which it was not thought prudent or "reverent" to inquire. Such speculations were needless, it was thought, and might be dangerous, and therefore the discussion was to be carried on unhampered by such refinements of reasoning. The question before the public was simply whether the Apostolic Succession, Baptismal Regeneration, a species of Sacrifice in the Eucharist, and other kindred doctrines, were or were not universally believed to be of apostolic origin by the Christians of the first three or four centuries. The settlement of this doubt was, it was universally conceived, not very difficult. Bible-readers, both High Church and Low Church, who found unexplainable difficulties in Scripture, were agreed in their interpretation of the Fathers—at least, at second hand. Moreover, the real writings of the Fathers were, as a fact, known to very few, and therefore *their* difficulties were unknown; whereas the Bible was in every body's hands, and its mysteries were familiar to all. Reasoning, accordingly, *per saltum*, with true popular recklessness, the multitude concluded that the Fathers were easy to be understood. And thus the matter was settled between the opponents. In their secret hearts they reasoned as follows: "The Bible," argued

the Tractarians, "is difficult, but the Bible plainly says that Tradition is to be revered; the Fathers are easy, and the Fathers say that such and such doctrines *are* taught by Apostolic Tradition; *therefore*, the only right way to ascertain truth is to ascertain what the Fathers thus assert to be traditional, and to believe it accordingly." The Evangelicals, on the other hand, thus syllogised: "The Bible is the word of God, *therefore* it is easy to be understood; the Fathers are not inspired, *therefore* what they state historically is not to be believed; moreover, the Fathers are Antilutheran and Papistical, *therefore* they are wrong." The Evangelicals had, further, a corollary to these propositions, which they only hinted in print, but ceased not to utter plainly in private and in sermons. It ran thus: "The Bible is easy only to the spiritually-minded; *therefore* it is easy to *all* who are spiritually-minded. The Puseyites say it is not easy to *them*; *therefore* they are *not* spiritually-minded."

And thus stood the controversy at the conclusion of its third year of existence. The dreams of its earliest infancy were fading into oblivion; romance was giving place to reality; already the movement was displaying somewhat of the energy and recklessness of advancing youth; and henceforth we have to watch its rapid progress towards a vigorous manhood. Then came its transitory season of maturity, its speedy decay, and its second childhood. In our next Number we shall continue to trace its history. Meanwhile, we pause for a brief retrospect of its early stages. Commencing with an undoubting faith in the divine origin of the Established Church, its aim was to carry out her true (supposed) principles, and to defend her against her enemies. It had no misgivings as to her essentially primitive and apostolic character. It had few, if any, secret sympathies for Rome. It viewed Puritanism, in all its modifications, as an incubus upon Catholic truth. It abhorred Erastianism, and believed the Reformation to have been conducted on Antierastian principles. Accordingly its conduct was in harmony with its aim. It established daily prayers; it taught justification by sacramental grace; it urged weekly administrations of Holy Communion; it practised fasting and other mortifications; it extolled the Bishops, and looked to them to fight for the Church against the State; it called for a restoration of Church discipline; it claimed the right of giving absolution to the sinner; and all these things it justified by appeals to the opinions of a large body of Anglican divines of the past three hundred years.

As time rolled on, and controversialists attacked the move-

ment, and the influx of minds of various types compelled its leaders, even when most unwilling, to contemplate the consequences of their views, its patristic aspect grew more prominent, and it was compelled to defend itself more in detail against suspicions of Romanising, and against Rome herself. The difficulty of using the Fathers at once against Protestantism and against "Romanism" was every day found more insurmountable. The old Anglican nonjuring theory was no longer applicable. A new position, both offensive and defensive, must be taken up. The threats of Rome must be warded off, while her beauties were acknowledged and her wealth appropriated; and all this without giving fresh handle to the carping unfairness of the Ultraprotestants.

Thus, then, the first epoch of Puseyism was consummated. It stood face to face with the Catholic Church, attracted, confounded, terrified. No suspicion had as yet touched its conscience that, after all, the Anglican Church might be no better than a mob of Wesleyans or Calvinists. The Anglican hierarchy had not as yet "pronounced" against the agitators. It still seemed possible to shew that the Church of England *was* Catholic, and the idea of "unprotestantising" her was as yet in the womb of time. Rome was still to be combated, and not conciliated, far less obeyed. The British monarch was still the Defender of the Faith; and girding themselves up with new energies for the conflict, the gathering hosts of Tractarianism prepared new weapons for the discomfiture of their foes. How they fought, and how they prospered, we shall in due time see.

Ecclesiastical Register.

APOSTOLICAL LETTER OF OUR MOST HOLY FATHER POPE PIUS IX.

RE-ESTABLISHING THE CATHOLIC HIERARCHY IN ENGLAND.

PIUS PP. IX.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

UNIVERSALIS Ecclesiæ regendæ potestas Romano Pontifici in sancto Petro Apostolorum Principe a Domino nostro Jesu Christo tradita præclaram illam in apostolica sede sollicitudinem quacumque ætate servavit, qua religionis Catholicæ bono ubicumque terrarum consuleret, ejusque incremento studiose provideret. Id autem Divini ipsius fundatoris consilio respondit, qui capite constituto Ecclesiæ incolumitati usque ad consummationem sæculi singulari sapientia propexit. Pontificiæ hujus sollicitudinis fructum sensit una cum aliis populis inclytum Angliæ

regnum, cujus historiae testantur Christianam religionem vel a primis Ecclesiae saeculis in Britanniam invectam esse, atque in ea deinde plurimum floruisse; sed medio circiter saeculo quinto, posteaquam Angli et Saxones in eam insulam advocati sunt, non modo publicas illic res, sed etiam religionem maximis fuisse detrimentis affectam. Constat vero simul sanctissimum praedecessorem nostrum Gregorium Magnum missis primum cum sociis Augustino monacho, atque eo postmodum aliisque pluribus ad Episcopalem dignitatem evectis, additaque iis magna presbyterorum monachorum copia, Anglo-Saxones adduxisse, ut Christianam religionem amplecterentur, et virtute sua effecisse, ut in Britannia, quae Anglia etiam appellari coepit, Catholica iterum restituta undique fuerit, et amplificata religio. Sed ut quae sunt recentiora commemoremus, nihil in tota Anglicani schismatis, quod saeculo decimo sexto excitatum est, historia manifestius arbitramur, quam Romanorum Pontificum praedecessorum nostrorum impensam curam, et nunquam intermissam, ut religioni Catholicae in eo regno in maximum periculum, et ad extremum discrimen adductae succurrerent, et quacumque possent ratione auxilium afferrent. Quo inter alia spectant, ea quae a Summis Pontificibus, vel ipsis mandantibus, atque probantibus provisa gestaque sunt, ut in Anglia haudquaquam deessent, qui Catholicarum illic rerum curam susciperent, itemque ut adolescentes Catholici bonae indolis, ex Anglia in continentem venientes, educarentur, atque ad scientias praesertim Ecclesiasticas diligentur informarentur; qui sacris subinde ordinibus insigniti et in patriam reversi sedulam navarent operam popularibus suis Verbi et Sacramentorum ministerio juvandis, et verae fidei ibidem tuendae ac propagandae.

Verum ea sunt fortasse clariora, quae praedecessorum nostrorum studium respiciunt, ut Angli Catholici, quos tam atrox, et saeva tempestas Episcoporum praesentia, et pastoralis cura privaverat, praesules iterum haberent episcopali characterе insignitos. Jam vero Gregorii XV. Litterae Apostolicae incipientes “Ecclesia Romana,” datae die XXIII. Martii, an. MDCXXIII. ostendunt, Summum Pontificem, ubi primum potuit, Guillelmum Bishopium consecratum Episcopum Chalcedonensem cum satis ampla facultatum copia, et cum ordinariorum propria potestate ad Angliae, et Scotiae Catholicos gubernandos destinasse; quod postea Urbanus VIII., Bishopio mortuo, missis ad Richardum Smith similis exempli Litteris Apostolicis die IV. Februarii, an. MDCXXV. renovavit, Episcopatu Chalcedonensi, et iisdem, quae Bishopio concessae fuerant, facultatibus Smithio tributis. Visa sunt in posterum, quum Jacobus II. in Anglia regnare coepisset, Catholicae religioni feliciora tempora obventura esse. Hac vero opportunitate Innocentius XI. statim usus Joannem Leyburnium Episcopum Adrumetenum totius Angliae regni Vicarium Apostolicum anno MDCLXXXV. deputavit. Quo facto aliis Litteris Apostolicis die XXX. Januarii, an. MDCLXXXVIII. editis, quarum initium est “Super Cathedram,” Leyburnio tres alios Episcopos Ecclesiarum in partibus infidelium titulis insignitos Vicarios Apostolicos adjunxit: quapropter Angliam universam, operam dante Apostolico in Anglia Nuntio Ferdinando Archiepiscopo Amasiensi, in quatuor districtus Pontifex ille partitus est, Londinensem scilicet, Occidentalem, Medium, et Septentrionalem, quibus omnibus Vicarii Apostolici cum opportunis facultatibus, et cum ordinarii locorum propria potestate praeesse coeperunt. Eis autem auctoritate sua, sapientissimisque responsis tum Benedictus XIV. edita die XXX. Maii, MDCCLIH. Constitutione, quae incipit “Apostolicum ministerium,” tum alii Pontifices praedecessores nostri, ac nostra Propagandae Fidei Congregatio ad tam grave munus rite recteque gerendum normae, et adjumento fuerunt.

Hæc vero totius Angliæ in quatuor Vicariatus Apostolicos partitio usque ad Gregorii XVI. tempora perduravit, qui Litteris Apostolicis die III. Julii, an. MDCCCXL. datis incipientibus "Muneris Apostolici" habita præsertim ratione incrementi, quod religio Catholica in eo regno jam acceperat, novaque facta regionum ecclesiastica partitione, duplo majorem Vicariatuum Apostolicorum numerum excitavit, et Angliam totam Vicariis Apostolicis Londinensi, Occidentali, Orientali, Centrali, Walliensi, Lancastriensi, Eboracensi, et Septentrionali, in spiritualibus gubernandam commisit. Quæ cursim hoc loco, aliis pluribus prætermissis, indicavimus, perspicuo documento sunt, prædecessores nostros in id vehementer incubuisse, ut, quantum auctoritate sua valebant, ad Ecclesiam in Anglia ex permagna calamitate recreandam, ac reficiendam adniterentur, et laborarent.

Habentes itaque ob oculos præclarum hujusmodi decessorum nostrorum exemplum, illudque pro supremi Apostolatus officio æmulari volentes, et animi etiam nostri inclinationi erga dilectam illam Dominicæ vineæ partem obsecundantes vel ab ipso pontificatus nostri exordio nobis proposuimus opus tam bene cœptum proseguere, et ad Ecclesiæ utilitatem in eo regno quotidi magis augendam nostra impensiora studia revocare. Quamobrem universam, ut nunc est, in Anglia rei Catholicæ statum diligenter considerantes, ac permagnum Catholicorum numerum qui passim ibi amplior evadit, animo rependentes, atque impedimenta illa in dies auferri nobiscum cogitantes, quæ Catholicæ religionis propagationi valde obfuerunt, tempus advenisse reputavimus, ut regiminis ecclesiastici forma in Anglia ad eum modum restitui possit, in quo libere est apud alias gentes, in quibus nulla sit peculiaris causa, ut extraordinario illo Vicariorum Apostolicorum ministerio regantur. Temporum scilicet ac rerum adjuncta effecisse sentiebamus, ut necesse non sit diutius Angliæ Catholicos a Vicariis Apostolicis gubernari, immo vero talem inibi rerum conversionem factam esse, ut ordinarii episcopalis regiminis formam flagitaret. Accessit his, Angliæ Vicarios Apostolicos ipsos id interea a nobis communi suffragio petiisse, permultos tam clericos, quam laicos virtute, ac genere spectatos viros hoc idem a nobis precatos esse, aliosque Angliæ Catholicos longe plurimos id in votis habere. Hæc animo volentes non omisimus Dei optimi maximi auxilium implorare, ut in rei tam gravis deliberatione id quod ad Ecclesiæ bonum augendum expeditius futurum esset, nos intelligere et recte implere possemus. Beatissimæ præterea Mariæ Virginis Deiparæ, et sanctorum, qui Angliam virtute sua illustrarunt, opem invocavimus, ut ad negotium istud feliciter absolvendum suo apud Deum patrocinio nobis adesse dignarentur. Tum vero rem universam venerabilibus fratribus nostris sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus nostræ Congregationis Propagandæ Fidei sedulo graviterque perpendendam commisimus. Eorum autem sententia fuit desiderio illi nostro prorsus consentanea, quam libenter probandam, et ad effectum perducendam judicavimus. Itaque post rem universam a nobis etiam accurata consideratione perpensam, motu proprio, certa scientia, ac de plenitudine apostolicæ nostræ potestatis constituimus, atque decernimus, ut in regno Angliæ refloreat juxta communes Ecclesiæ regulas hierarchia ordinariorum Episcoporum, qui a sedibus nuncupabuntur, quas hisce ipsis nostris Litteris in singulis apostolicorum vicariatuum districtibus constituimus.

Atque ut a districtu Londinensi initium faciamus, duæ in eo sedes erunt, Westmonasteriensis scilicet, quam ad metropolitanæ seu archiepiscopalis dignitatis gradum evehimus, et Suthwarcensis, quam uti et reliquas mox indicandas, eidem suffraganneas. Et Westmonasteriensis quidem diœcesis eam habebit memorati districtus partem, quæ ad sep-

tentrionem protenditur fluminis Tamesis, et comitatus Middlesexensem, Essexiensem, atque Hertfordiensem complectitur: Suthwarcensis vero partem reliquam ad meridiem fluminis, videlicet comitatus Bercheriensem, Suth-Hantoniensem, Surreiensem, Sussexiensem, et Kantiensem, una cum insulis Vecta, Ierseia, Gerneseia, aliisque prope illas sitis. In districtu Septentrionali unica erit sedes episcopalis, ab urbe Hagulstadeni nuncupanda, cujus diœcesis iisdem, quibus districtus ille, finibus continebitur. Eboracensis etiam districtus unicam efficiet diœcesin, cujus Episcopus in urbe Beverlaco sedem habebit. In districtu Lancastriensi duo erunt Episcopi, quorum alter a Liverpoolitana sede appellandus, pro diœcesi habebit, cum insula Mona, centurias Lonsdale, Amounderness, et West Derby: alter vero sedem habiturus a Salfordensi urbe nuncupandam, pro diœcesi obtinebit centurias Salford, Blackburn, et Leyland. Quod vero attinet ad Cestriensem comitatum, etsi ad districtum ipsum pertineat, eum nunc alii diœcesi adjungemus. In districtu Walliensi erunt binæ sedes episcopales, Salopiensis scilicet, ac Menevensis et Newportensis invicem unitæ: Salopiensis quidem diœcesis ad Septentrionalem districtus partem complectetur comitatus qui dicuntur Angleseia, Cærnarvonensis, Denbighensis, Flintensis, Merviniensis, et Montgomeryensis, quibus adjungimus Cestrensem comitatum ex districtu Lancastriensi, et ex Centrali districtu comitatum Salopiensem: Episcopo autem Meneviensi et Newportensi pro diœcesi assignamus ad Meridionalem districtus partem comitatus Brechiniensem, Maridunensem, Cereticensem, Glamorganiensem, Pembrochiensem, et Radnoriensem, necnon Anglos comitatus Monumethensem et Herefordensem. In districtu Occidentali duas constituimus episcopales sedes Cliftoniensem et Plymuthensem, quarum illi pro diœcesi assignamus comitatus Glocestriensem, Somersettensem, et Wiltoniensem; huic vero comitatus Devoniensem, Dorcestriensem, et Cornubiensem. Centralis districtus, a quo Salopianum comitatum jam sejunximus, duas habebit episcopales sedes Nottinghamiensem et Birminghamiensem: quarum primæ pro diœcesi assignamus comitatus Nottinghamiensem, Derbiiensem, Leicestriensem, nec non comitatus Lincolnensem et Rutlandiensem, quos a districtu Orientali separamus; alteri vero Staffordiensem, Warwicensensem, Wigorniensem, et Oxoniensem. Tandem in districtu Orientali unica erit episcopalis sedes, quæ a Northantoniensi urbe nuncupabitur, habebitque pro diœcesi districtum iisdem quibus in præsens limitibus definitum, exceptis tamen comitatibus Rutlandensi et Lincolnensi, quos supradictæ Nottinghamiensi diœcesi jam assignavimus.

Ita igitur in florentissimo Angliæ regno unica erit provincia ecclesiastica ex uno Archiepiscopo sue metropolitano antistite, et duodecim Episcopis illius suffraganeis constituta; quorum studiis et pastoralibus curis Catholicam illic rem Deo dante uberibus in dies auctibus amplificandam confidimus. Quare nobis et Romanis Pontificibus successoribus nostris jam nunc reservatum volumus, ut provinciam ipsam in plures dispertiamus, et augeamus prout res tulerit diœcesium numerum; ac generatim, ut quemadmodum opportunum in Domino visum fuerit, novas illarum circumscriptiones libere decernamus.

Interea Archiepiscopo et Episcopis supradictis mandamus, ut relationes de suarum ecclesiarum statu ad nostram Congregationem Propagandæ Fidei debitis temporibus transmittant, nec desistant eandem instructam reddere de iis omnibus, quæ spirituali suarum ovium bono noverint profutura. Nos enim in rebus ad Anglicanas ecclesias pertinentibus ministerio ejusdem congregationis uti pergemus. Verum in sacro cleri populique regimine, atque in ceteris quæ ad pastorale officium pertinent, Archiepiscopus et Episcopi Angliæ jam nunc omnibus fruentur

juribus et facultatibus, quibus alii aliarum gentium Catholici Archiepiscopi et Episcopi ex communi sacrorum canonum, et apostolicarum constitutionum ordinatione utuntur et uti possunt, atque obstringentur pariter iis obligationibus quæ alios Archiepiscopos et Episcopos ex eadem communi Catholice Ecclesie disciplina obstringunt. Quæcumque autem sive in antiqua ecclesiarum Angliæ ratione, sive in subsequenti missionum statu ex specialibus constitutionibus, aut privilegiis, vel consuetudinibus peculiaribus viguerint, mutata nunc temporum causa, nullum posthac sive jus sive obligationem inducent: qua de re ut nulla remanere dubitatio valeat, nos iisdem illis peculiaribus constitutionibus, ac privilegiis cujusque generis, et consuetudinibus a quocumque etiam vetustissimo et immemorabili tempore inductis omnem prorsus obligandi aut juris afferendi vim ex plenitudine apostolicæ nostræ auctoritatis tollimus et abrogamus. Hinc Archiepiscopo et Episcopis Angliæ integrum erit ea porro decernere, quæ ad communis juris executionem pertinent, quæve ex generali ipsa Ecclesie disciplina Episcoporum auctoritati permissa sunt. Nos autem haud certe omitemus adesse illis apostolica auctoritate nostra, et perlubenti etiam animo obsecundabimus eorundem postulationibus in iis, quæ ad majorem Divini nominis gloriam animarumque salutem conducere visa fuerint. Enimvero nos in restitutione ordinariæ Episcoporum hierarchiæ, et communis Ecclesie juris observatione nostris hisce Litteris decernenda eo quidem præcipue spectavimus, ut Catholice religionis per Angliæ regnum prosperitati et incremento prospiceremus; sed una simul propositum nobis fuit votis annuere tum venerabilium fratrum eo in regno sacras res vicaria apostolicæ sedis auctoritate moderantium, tum plurimorum dilectorum filiorum ex Catholico clero ac populo, a quibus impensissimas in eum finem preces acceperamus. Hoc ipsum non semel postulaverant illorum majores a prædecessoribus nostris, qui sane Vicarios Apostolicos tum demum in Anglia deputare orsi fuerant cum nulli ibidem manere poterant Catholici antistites propriam in regno ipso ecclesiam ordinario jure obtinentes, atque hinc illorum consilium in vicariorum numero et vicarialibus ipsis districtibus deinceps iterum atque iterum multiplicandis, non eo certe spectabat ut Catholicam rem in Angliæ regno extraordinaria jugiter ratione moderarentur, sed potius ut ejus incremento prout tempora ferebant prospicientes viam una simul pararent ordinariæ illic hierarchiæ tandem aliquando instaurandæ.

Itaque nos, quibus tantum opus perficere summo Dei beneficio datum est, hoc ipso in loco declaratum volumus, longe prorsus abesse a mente consiliisque nostris, ut antistites Angliæ, ordinariorum Episcoporum nomine ac juribus insigniti quacumque alia in re commodis destituantur, quibus antehac una cum Apostolicorum Vicariorum titulo fruebantur. Nec enim ratio sinit, ut in illorum detrimentum cedant quæ a nobis ex Catholicorum Anglorum voto in bonum sacræ apud ipsos rei decreta sunt. Juxta hæc firmissima immo spe nitimur fore ut iidem dilecti nostri in Christo filii qui in regno Angliæ Catholicam rem, et antistites vicaria illam auctoritate moderantes in tanta varietate temporum eleemosynis ac largitionibus suis juvare numquam destiterant, majori porro liberalitate usuri sint erga Episcopos ipsos Anglicanis Ecclesiis stabiliiori nunc vinculo alligatos, quo scilicet iisdem minime desint temporalia subsidia in templorum et divini cultus splendorem, in cleri pauperumque sustentationem, atque in alios usus ecclesiasticos eroganda. Ad extremum, levantes oculos nostros in montes, unde veniet auxilium nobis a Deo optimo maximo in omni oratione, et obsecratione, cum gratiarum actione, supplices poscimus, ut quæ a nobis pro Ecclesie bono decreta sunt, Divini auxilii sui virtute confirmet, iisque, ad quos rerum

a nobis decretarum exequutio plurimum pertinet, gratiæ suæ robur adjiciat, ut pascant, qui in iis est gregem Dei, atque ut ad majorem ejus nominis gloriam propagandam semper impensius incumbant. Atque ad uberiora in idipsum cœlestis gratiæ præsidia impetranda, deprecatores apud Deum denuo invocamus sanctissimam Dei Matrem, beatos Apostolos Petrum et Paulum, cum ceteris cœlitibus Angliæ patronis, ac nominatim S. Gregorium Magnum, ut, quoniam nobis etiam meritis adeo imparibus datum nunc est episcopales sedes in Anglia renovare, prout ille cum summa Ecclesiæ utilitate sua perfecit, hæc quoque facta a nobis in eo regno episcopalium diœcesium restitutio religioni Catholice benevertat. Decernentes has nostras Apostolicas Litteras nullo unquam tempore de subreptionis, et obreptionis vitio, vel intentionis nostræ aut alio quocumque defectu notari, vel impugnari posse, sed semper validas, et firmas fore, suosque effectus in omnibus obtinere, atque inviolabiliter observari debere. Non obstantibus Apostolicis, atque in synodalibus, provincialibus, et universalibus conciliis editis generalibus, vel specialibus sanctionibus, nec non veterum Angliæ sedium, et missionum, ac Vicariatuum Apostolicorum inibi postea constitutorum, et quarumcumque ecclesiarum, ac piorum locorum juribus, aut privilegiis juramento etiam, confirmatione Apostolica, aut alia quacumque firmitate roboratis, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque. His enim omnibus, tametsi pro illorum derogatione specialis mentio facienda esset, aut alia quantumvis exquisita forma servanda, quatenus supradictis obstant, expresse derogamus. Irritum quoque, et inane decernimus si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Volumus autem ut harum Litterarum exemplis etiam impressis, manuque publici notarii subscriptis, et per constitutum in ecclesiastica dignitate virum suo sigillo munitis eadem habeatur fides, quæ nostræ voluntatis significationi, ipso hoc diplomate ostenso haberetur.

Datum Romæ, apud S. Petrum, sub Annulo Piscatoris, die XXIX. Septembris, MDCCCL. Pontificatus nostri anno quinto.

A. CARD. LAMBRUSCHINI.

[*Translation.*]

PIUS IX., POPE.

FOR A PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE OF THE THING.

THE power of governing the universal Church, entrusted by our Lord Jesus Christ to the Roman Pontiff, in the person of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, hath maintained in every age in the Apostolic See that admirable solicitude wherewith it watches over the good of the Catholic religion throughout all the world, and provides with zeal for its progress. And thus answers the design of its Divine Founder, who, in establishing a chief, hath, with singular wisdom, provided for the security of the Church until the consummation of the world. The effect of this pontifical solicitude hath been felt as in other nations, so in the noble kingdom of England. The records thereof bear witness that from the first ages of the Church the Christian religion was carried into Britain, and that it afterwards flourished there very greatly; but that towards the middle of the fifth century, after the Anglo-Saxons had been called into that island, not only the commonwealth, but religion also, was seen to fall into the most deplorable condition. But it is recorded that our most holy predecessor Gregory the Great immediately sent thither the monk Augustine, with his companions, and afterwards raised him and a great number of others to the episcopal

dignity ; added unto them a multitude of monks and priests ; brought the Anglo-Saxons to the Christian religion ; and arrived by his influence at the result of re-establishing and extending the Catholic faith in all that country, which began at that time to be called England. But to recall more recent facts, nothing seems to us more evident in the whole history of the Anglican schism consummated in the sixteenth century, than the active and ever-persevering solicitude of the Roman Pontiffs our predecessors in succouring and sustaining by every means the Catholic religion, exposed in that kingdom to the greatest dangers, and a prey to the fury of its enemies. It was in this view, not to speak of other works which were done with such great efforts by the Sovereign Pontiffs, or by their orders and with their approbation, to the end that in England there might never be wanting men to undertake the care of Catholic affairs in that country, and that Catholic youth endowed with good capacity, coming from England to the continent, might be educated, and be carefully formed, particularly in ecclesiastical studies, in order that, being invested with holy orders, and thereafter returning to their country, they might diligently labour in supporting their countrymen by the ministration of the Word and of the Sacraments, and in defending and propagating the true faith among them.

But the zeal of our predecessors will, perhaps, be more clearly recognised in what they did to give to the English Catholics pastors invested with the Episcopal character, at a time when a furious and cruel tempest had deprived them of the presence of their Bishops, and of their pastoral care. In the first place, the Apostolical Letter of Gregory XV., commencing with these words, *Ecclesia Romana*, and dated the 23d of March, 1623, shews that the Sovereign Pontiff, the first moment that it was possible for him, deputed to the government of the English and Scottish Catholics William Bishop, consecrated Bishop of Chalcedon, with ample faculties and the proper power of ordinaries. After the death of Bishop, Urban VIII. renewed this mission, in his similar Apostolical Letter dated the 4th of February, 1625, which he addressed to Richard Smith, conferring on him the Bishopric of Chalcedon, and all the powers granted to Bishop. It appeared afterwards, at the commencement of the reign of James II., that more favourable days were about to arise for the Catholic religion. Innocent XI. immediately profiting by the circumstance, in 1685 deputed John Leyburn, Bishop of Adrumetum, as Vicar-Apostolic of all the kingdom of England. Which being done, by another Apostolical Letter, dated the 30th of January, 1688, and commencing with these words, *Super Cathedram*, he joined with him three other Vicars-Apostolic, Bishops *in partibus* ; in such wise, that all England, with the assistance of the Nuncio-Apostolic in that country, Ferdinand Archbishop of Amasia, was divided by that Pontiff into four districts—those of London, the Western, of Central, and the Northern—all which began to be governed by Vicars-Apostolic, furnished with the necessary faculties and with the proper power of ordinaries. For the proper accomplishment of so grave a charge, they received rules and succours, whether by the authority and most wise decisions of Benedict XIV., in his Constitution of the 30th of May, 1753, which commences with these words, *Apostolicum Ministerium*, or by those of the other Pontiffs our predecessors, and of our Congregation of Propaganda. This division of all England into four Vicariates-Apostolic lasted up to the time of Gregory XVI., who, in his Apostolical Letter, *Muneris Apostolici*, dated the 3d of July, 1840, considering especially the growth the Catholic religion had already made in that kingdom, and making a new ecclesiastical division of the country, doubled the

number of Vicariates-Apostolic, and entrusted the spiritual government of all England to the Vicars-Apostolic of the districts of London, of the west, of the east, of the centre, of Wales, of Lancaster, of York, and of the north. The little which we have just said, passing by many other things in silence, clearly proves that our predecessors strongly applied themselves to use all the means which their authority afforded to restore the Church in England after her immense disasters, and to labour to raise her up. Having, then, before our eyes this noble example of our predecessors, and wishing, by imitating it, to fulfil the duties of the supreme Apostolate; desirous, moreover, to follow the movements of our heart for this beloved portion of the vineyard of the Lord, we proposed to ourselves, from the commencement of our Pontificate, to pursue a work so well begun, and to apply ourselves, in the most serious manner, daily to favour the development of the Church in that kingdom. Wherefore, considering diligently the actual state of Catholicism in England; reflecting on the very great number of the Catholics, which is ever increasing; observing that the obstacles are daily falling down which so strongly opposed the propagation of the Catholic religion; we have thought that the time has arrived to bring back in England the form of the ecclesiastical government to that which it freely is in the other nations, where no particular cause necessitates the ministration of Vicars-Apostolic. We have thought that, from the progress of times and circumstances, it is no longer necessary to have the English Catholics governed by Vicars-Apostolic, and that, on the contrary, such a change has been effected there, that it required the form of the ordinary episcopal government. Added to which, the Vicars-Apostolic of England meanwhile, by their common suffrage, besought of us this boon, as also did many of the clergy and laity distinguished for their virtue and their rank, and a very great majority of the other English Catholics. Revolving these things in our mind, we did not fail to implore the succour of Almighty God, that, in the deliberation of such an important affair, it might be given to us to know and rightly to fulfil that which should be most adapted to augment the good of the Church. Furthermore, we implored the aid of the most holy Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and that of the Saints who have illustrated England by their virtues, to the end that they might deign, by their intercession with God, to obtain for us the happy success of this enterprise. We then entrusted the whole affair to the grave and serious study of our venerable brothers the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, constituting our Congregation of Propaganda. Their sentiments having been altogether conformable to our desire, we resolved freely to approve of it, and to put it into execution. For which reason, after having weighed with an accurate consideration all this affair, of our own motion, of our certain knowledge, and by the plenitude of our Apostolical power, we have decreed, and we do decree, that there be re-established in the kingdom of England the hierarchy of ordinary Bishops, according to the common rules of the Church, drawing their denomination from their sees, which we constitute by the present letter in the different districts of the Vicariates-Apostolic.

To commence with the district of London: it shall form two sees—to wit, that of Westminster, which we elevate to the metropolitan or archiepiscopal dignity, and that of Southwark, which we assign to it as suffragan, as also the others which we are about to indicate. The diocese of Westminster shall include that part of the said district which is extended on the north of the Thames, and comprise the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Hertford; but the diocese of Southwark shall

include the counties of Berks, Southampton, Surrey, Sussex, and Kent, with the islands of Wight, of Jersey, of Guernsey, and the others adjacent. In the Northern district there shall only be one episcopal see, which shall take its name from the town of Hexham, and the circumscription of which shall be that of the district. The district of York shall also form only one diocese, the Bishop of which shall have for his see Beverley. In the Lancashire district there shall be two Bishops, of whom one, to be named from the see of Liverpool, shall have for his diocese, with the Isle of Man, the districts of Lonsdale, Amounderness, and of West Derby; the other, who shall have the see of Salford, shall extend his jurisdiction over Salford, Blackburn, and Leyland. As for the county of Chester, although it belongs to this district, we unite it to another diocese. In the district of Wales there shall be two episcopal sees—to wit, that of Shrewsbury, and that of Menevia and Newport united. The diocese of Shrewsbury shall comprise, in the northern part of the district, the counties of Anglesey, Carnarvon, Denbigh, Flint, Merioneth, and Montgomery; to which we join the county of Chester, detached from the Lancashire district, and that of Shrewsbury from the Central district. We assign to the Bishop of Menevia and Newport for his diocese the southern counties of the district,—Brecknock, Carmarthen, Cardigan, Glamorgan, Pembroke, and Radnor, as also the English counties of Monmouth and Hereford. In the western district we create two episcopal sees, Clifton and Plymouth; the former shall have the counties of Gloucester, Somerset, and Wilts; the latter those of Devon, Dorset, and Cornwall. The Central district, from which we have already detached the county of Shrewsbury, shall have two episcopal sees, Nottingham and Birmingham: to the former, we assign for a diocese the counties of Nottingham, of Derby, of Leicester, and those of Lincoln and of Rutland, which we separate from the Eastern district; to the latter, the counties of Stafford, of Warwick, of Worcester, and of Oxford. Lastly, in the Eastern district there shall only be one episcopal see, which shall take its name from the city of Northampton, and shall retain the circumscription of the actual district, with the exception of the counties of Lincoln and of Rutland, which we have assigned to the aforesaid diocese of Nottingham.

Thus in the most flourishing kingdom of England there shall be one single ecclesiastical province, composed of one Archbishop or Metropolitan, and of twelve Bishops his suffragans; the abundant zeal and the pastoral labours of whom we hope, by the grace of God, will daily give new increase to Catholicity. For this reason, we will even now reserve to ourselves and to our successors, to divide this province into several, and to augment the number of the dioceses, according as circumstances shall require; and in general, freely to fix their new circumscriptions, according as it shall seem convenient in the Lord.

Meanwhile we order the Archbishop and Bishops aforesaid to send, at the appointed times, reports on the state of their churches to our Congregation of Propaganda, and by no means to neglect informing it of all the things that they shall judge profitable to the spiritual good of their flocks. For we will continue, in whatever concerns the affairs of the churches of England, to use the services of that Congregation. But in the sacred government of the clergy and of the people, and for all that which regards the pastoral office, the English Archbishop and Bishops shall even now enjoy all such rights and faculties as, according to the common dispositions of the sacred canons and of the apostolical constitutions, other Archbishops and Bishops use and may use; and in like manner they shall be bound by the obligations to which other

Archbishops and Bishops are subject by the common discipline of the Catholic Church.

But whatever may have been in force, whether in the ancient form of the Church of England, or in the subsequent state of the missions, in virtue of special constitutions, or privileges, or peculiar customs, now that circumstances are no longer the same, shall henceforth imply neither right nor obligation. And to the end that no doubt may remain concerning that matter, by the plenitude of our Apostolical authority, we take away and abrogate entirely all the obligatory and juridical force of the same peculiar constitutions and privileges, of whatever kind, and customs, derived from a period however remote and immemorable. The Archbishop and Bishops of England shall, therefore, have the integral power of regulating all the things which appertain to the execution of the common law, or which are left to the authority of Bishops by the general discipline of the Church. For us, assuredly, we shall never fail to assist them with our Apostolical authority; and we shall always be most ready to meet their requests in whatever shall seem to us fitted to procure the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls. In decreeing by these letters the restoration of the ordinary Hierarchy of Bishops, and the putting into operation the common law of the Church, we have had principally in view to provide for the prosperity and increase of the Catholic religion in the kingdom of England; but we have also wished to accede to the wishes as well of our Venerable Brothers governing sacred affairs in that kingdom in the quality of Vicars of the Apostolic See, as of a great number of our dear sons among the clergy and the Catholic people, who had addressed to us the most urgent petitions for this object. Their ancestors several times made the same request to our predecessors, who had begun to send Vicars-Apostolic in England, when no Catholic Bishop could remain there holding by ordinary right a church of his own in the kingdom itself, and who had afterwards multiplied the number of the vicars and of the vicariate districts, not certainly with the view that religion should be for ever subjected in that country to an exceptional form of government, but rather that providing according to circumstances for its increase, they might at the same time prepare there the way for the future re-establishment of the ordinary hierarchy.

It is for this reason that we, to whom it has been given by the infinite goodness of God to accomplish this great work, desire here to declare that it is in nowise either in our mind or our purposes that the Bishops of England, provided with the name and the rights of ordinary Bishops, should be deprived in any thing else whatever of the advantages which they formerly enjoyed under the title of Vicars-Apostolic. For reason would not permit us to turn to their detriment the decrees passed by us, at the prayers of the English Catholics, for the good of religion. We accordingly draw from these considerations the firm hope that our most dear brethren in Christ, whose alms and largesses have never failed to sustain in England religion, and the prelates who have there governed it in quality of vicars in times so diverse, will use a liberality yet greater towards the Bishops themselves, now attached by a more stable bond to the English Churches, so that they may not be deprived of the temporal subsidies for which they may have occasion for the ornament of the temples and the splendour of divine worship, for the maintenance of the clergy and of the poor, and for the other ecclesiastical services. Lastly, lifting our eyes to the mountains from whence the help of Almighty God shall come to us, we beseech him earnestly, by all prayer, supplication, and thanksgiving, to confirm, by the virtue of divine

grace, that which we have decreed for the good of the Church, and to give the strength of grace to those to whom appertains especially the execution of our decree, to the end that they may feed the flock of God committed to their keeping, and that their zeal may more and more apply itself to propagate the greater glory of his name, and to obtain more abundant succours of heavenly grace. We finally invoke, as intercessors with God, the most holy Mother of God, the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, with the other heavenly patrons of England, and by name St. Gregory the Great, to the end that, since it hath now been given to us, though of merit so unequal, to renew the episcopal sees in England, as he did to the very great advantage of the Church in his time, this restitution which we also have made of episcopal sees in that kingdom may turn to the good of the Catholic religion. We decree that this Apostolical Letter be never, at any time, taxed as subreptitious or obreptitious, or be noted or impugned with any defect arising from our intention, or with any other defect whatever, but that it be always valid and firm, and hold good in all its effect, to be inviolably observed, notwithstanding general apostolical edicts, those which have been passed by Councils synodal, provincial, or universal, or special sanctions, as well as the rights of the old sees of England, and of the missions, and of the vicariates apostolic constituted therein afterwards, of the rights or privileges of any churches whatever, and of holy places, even guaranteed by oath, by the apostolical confirmation, or in any other manner whatsoever, notwithstanding all other things whatever contrary hereunto. For from all these things we expressly derogate, in so far as they are contrary to the aforesaid, even though, to derogate therefrom, special mention of them ought to be made, or any other particular formality observed. We decree also to be null and void whatever may happen to be attempted by any one against these things, on whatever authority, knowingly or ignorantly. We furthermore will that the copies of this letter, even printed, provided that they are subscribed by a notary public, and furnished with the seal of a man constituted in ecclesiastical dignity, be received as the original diploma wherein is consigned this expression of our will.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, under the Ring of the Fisherman, the 24th day of September, 1850, the fifth year of our Pontificate.

A. CARD. LAMBRUSCHINI.

PASTORAL LETTER OF CARDINAL WISEMAN

TO THE CLERGY AND FAITHFUL OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF LONDON
AND DIOCESE OF SOUTHWARK.

NICHOLAS, by the Divine mercy, of the holy Roman Church by the title of St. Pudenciana Cardinal Priest, Archbishop of Westminster, and Administrator Apostolic of the Diocese of Southwark:

To our dearly beloved in Christ, the Clergy secular and regular, and the Faithful of the said Archdiocese and Diocese:

Health and benediction in the Lord!—If this day we greet you under a new title, it is not, dearly beloved, with an altered affection. If in words we seem to divide those who till now have formed, under our rule, a single flock, our heart is as undivided as ever in your regard. For now truly do we feel closely bound to you by new and stronger ties of charity; now do we embrace you in our Lord Christ Jesus with more

tender emotions of paternal love; now doth our soul yearn, and our mouth is open to you, though words must fail to express what we feel on being once again permitted to address you. For if our parting was in sorrow, and we durst not hope that we should again face to face behold you, our beloved flock, so much the greater is now our consolation and our joy, when we find ourselves not so much permitted as commissioned to return to you by the supreme ruler of the Church of Christ.

But how can we for one moment indulge in selfish feelings, when, through that loving Father's generous and wise counsels, the greatest of blessings has just been bestowed upon our country, by the restoration of its true Catholic hierarchical government, in communion with the see of Peter?

For on the twenty-ninth day of last month, on the Feast of the Archangel Saint Michael, prince of the heavenly host, his Holiness Pope Pius IX. was graciously pleased to issue his Letters Apostolic, under the Fisherman's Ring, conceived in terms of great weight and dignity, wherein he substituted for the eight Apostolic Vicariates heretofore existing, one archiepiscopal or metropolitan and twelve episcopal sees; repealing at the same time, and annulling, all dispositions and enactments made for England by the Holy See with reference to its late form of ecclesiastical government.

And by a brief dated the same day his Holiness was further pleased to appoint us, though most unworthy, to the archiepiscopal see of Westminster, established by the above-mentioned Letters Apostolic, giving us at the same time the administration of the episcopal see of Southwark. So that at present, and till such time as the Holy See shall think fit otherwise to provide, we govern, and shall continue to govern, the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, and Essex, as ordinary thereof, and those of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Berkshire, and Hampshire, with the islands annexed, as administrator with ordinary jurisdiction.

Further, we have to announce to you, dearly beloved in Christ, that, as if still further to add solemnity and honour before the Church to this noble act of Apostolic authority, and to give an additional mark of paternal benevolence towards the Catholics of England, his Holiness was pleased to raise us, in the private consistory of Monday the 30th of September, to the rank of Cardinal Priest of the holy Roman Church. And on the Thursday next ensuing, being the third day of this month of October, in public consistory, he delivered to us the insignia of this dignity, the cardinalitial hat; assigning us afterwards for our title in the private consistory which we attended, the Church of St. Pudentiana, in which St. Peter is groundedly believed to have enjoyed the hospitality of the noble and partly British family of the Senator Pudens.

In that same consistory we were enabled ourselves to ask for the archiepiscopal pallium for our new see of Westminster; and this day we have been invested, by the hands of the Supreme Pastor and Pontiff himself, with this badge of metropolitan jurisdiction.

The great work, then, is complete; what you have long desired and prayed for is granted. Your beloved country has received a place among the fair Churches, which, normally constituted, form the splendid aggregate of Catholic Communion: Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had long vanished, and begins now anew its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity, the source of jurisdiction, of light, and of vigour. How wonderfully all this has been brought about, how clearly the hand of God has been shewn in every step, we have not now leisure to relate, but we may hope soon to recount to you by word of mouth.

In the mean time we will content ourselves with assuring you, that, if the concordant voice of those venerable and most eminent counsellors to whom the Holy See commits the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in missionary countries, of the overruling of every variety of interests and designs, to the rendering of this measure almost necessary ; if the earnest prayers of our holy Pontiff and his most sacred oblation of the divine sacrifice, added to his own deep and earnest reflection, can form to the Catholic heart an earnest of heavenly direction, an assurance that the Spirit of truth, who guides the Church, has here inspired its Supreme Head, we cannot desire stronger or more consoling evidence that this most important measure is from God, has his sanction and blessing, and will consequently prosper.

Then truly is this day to us a day of joy and exaltation of spirit, the crowning day of long hopes, and the opening day of bright prospects. How must the Saints of our country, whether Roman or British, Saxon or Norman, look down from their seats of bliss, with beaming glance, upon this new evidence of the faith and Church which led them to glory, sympathising with those who have faithfully adhered to them through centuries of ill repute for the truth's sake, and now reap the fruit of their patience and long-suffering. And all those blessed martyrs of these latter ages, who have fought the battles of the faith under such discouragement, who mourned, more than over their own fetters or their own pain, over the desolate ways of their own Sion, and the departure of England's religious glory ; oh ! how must they bless God, who hath again visited his people,—how take part in our joy, as they see the lamp of the temple again enkindled and rebrichtening, as they behold the silver links of that chain which has connected their country with the see of Peter in its vicarial government changed into burnished gold ; not stronger nor more closely knit, but more beautifully wrought and more brightly arrayed.

And in nothing will it be fairer or brighter than in this, that the glow of more fervent love will be upon it. Whatever our sincere attachment and unflinching devotion to the Holy See till now, there is a new ingredient cast into these feelings ; a warmer gratitude, a tenderer affection, a profounder admiration, a boundless and endless sense of obligation, for so new, so great, so sublime a gift, will be added to past sentiments of loyalty and fidelity to the supreme see of Peter. Our venerable Pontiff has shewn himself a true shepherd, a true father ; and we cannot but express our gratitude to him in our most fervent language, in the language of prayer. For when we raise our voices, as is meet, in loud and fervent thanksgiving to the Almighty, for the precious gifts bestowed upon our portion of Christ's vineyard, we will also implore every choice blessing on him who has been so signally the divine instrument in procuring it. We will pray that his rule over the Church may be prolonged to many years, for its welfare ; that health and strength may be preserved to him for the discharge of his arduous duties ; that light and grace may be granted to him proportioned to the sublimity of his office ; and that consolations, temporal and spiritual, may be poured out upon him abundantly, in compensation for past sorrows and past ingratitude. And of these consolations may one of the most sweet to his paternal heart be the propagation of holy religion in our country, the advancement of his spiritual children there in true piety and devotion, and our ever-increasing affection and attachment to the see of St. Peter.

In order, therefore, that our thanksgiving may be made with all becoming solemnity, we hereby enjoin as follows :

1. This our Pastoral Letter shall be publicly read in all the churches and chapels of the archdiocese of Westminster and the diocese of Southwark on the Sunday after its being received.

2. On the following Sunday there shall be in every such church or chapel a solemn Benediction of the blessed Sacrament, at which shall be sung the *Te Deum*, with the usual versicles and prayers, with the prayer also *Fidelium Deus Pastor et Rector* for the Pope.

3. The collect, *Pro Gratiarum Actione*, or thanksgiving, and that for the Pope, shall be recited in the Mass of that day, and for two days following.

4. Where Benediction is never given, the *Te Deum*, with its prayers, shall be recited or sung after Mass, and the collects above-named shall be added as enjoined.

And at the same time, earnestly entreating for ourselves also a place in your fervent prayers, we lovingly implore for you, and bestow on you, the blessing of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Given out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome, this seventh day of October, in the year of our Lord MDCCCL.

(Signed)

NICHOLAS,

Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

By command of his Eminence,

FRANCIS SEARLE, Secretary.

NEW CHURCH AND MISSION AT GATESHEAD.

WE beg to call attention to the following extracts from an address to his flock from the Rev. F. Betham, as supplying the history of the persecution of a Catholic mission in past times, and as furnishing an instance of the manner in which the restoration of what has long been lost may be commenced on the soundest Catholic principles. Mr. Betham has adopted the plan, which cannot be too much recommended, of erecting a temporary building, until a fitting church can be erected. There will be no seat-rents of any kind.

“Benigne fac Domine in bona voluntate tua Sion: ut ædificentur muri Jerusalem.”

Ps. l.

To the faithful Catholics of the Parish of Gateshead, in the Diocese of Hexham.

Dearly beloved in the Lord,—To build up the ruined walls of Jerusalem is one of the chiefest cares of the watchmen of Sion: and hence it is with no ordinary feelings of gladness that I this day give myself to a work which, from the time I have known the ancient kingdom of Northumbria, has claimed a foremost place in my heart. Gateshead, once the habitation of holy religious, has been too long left a widow, deprived of a church or resident pastor. . . . It was here that the Rev. John Ingram, who is commemorated under No. 104 in the Memoirs of the Missionary Priests, was concealed in the time of the fierce persecution of Elizabeth; but to no purpose, for afterwards falling into the hands of his enemies, he was committed to Durham gaol, put to the rack and tortured by order of the Count Palatine (an ecclesiastic be it remembered), and afterwards arraigned of high treason for the crime of being a priest, and officiating as such; and finally, on the 25th July, 1594, hanged, drawn, and quartered in front of the house and chapel of the

Riddells in Gateshead, although one thousand crowns were offered by the Riddells, and the same sum by the Tempests of Stella Hall, and other families in Newcastle, to have his life spared; but, as the judge who condemned him intimated, he was too indefatigable a missionary to be allowed to escape. . . . The chapel in the house of the Riddells continued to be regularly served by priests, and in 1731 the Rev. Thomas Maire, S. J., was incumbent thereof: in 1746, however, on the return of Cumberland from his bloody raid in Scotland, after the defeat of the Scottish adherents of the Prince at Culloden, a mob collected in Gateshead to do the Duke honour as he passed, set fire to Gateshead House, the residence of the Riddells, which, together with the chapel, was burnt to the ground. The clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Walsh, fled to Felling Hall, then the seat of the Brandlings. Shortly afterwards he removed to a house in the Close, Newcastle, where he died in 1775, and was buried in St. Nicholas' churchyard. He was succeeded by the Rev. William Warrilow, of Ellingham in Northumberland, who removed from the Close to Westgate Street, where he fitted up an upper room for a chapel. For we must bear in mind that the penal laws against Catholics were not relaxed until the year 1778, so that it was unsafe to open public chapels. . . . The Rev. Mr. Warrilow died on the 18th November, 1807, and was interred in St. John's churchyard. From this time (until the building of St. Mary's Church, Clayton Street West) there was but one chapel, that of the Rev. James Worswick, representing the united parishes of Newcastle and Gateshead. The late Bishop Riddell made many efforts to restore the old chapel in Gateshead, but the prescribed time was not yet come. . . . Our present venerable Bishop no sooner succeeded him in the government of the Northumbrian churches than he began to turn his eyes towards Gateshead; and it is now eighteen months since his Lordship first proposed to me, although most unworthy, the task of reconstructing the former church of Gateshead, now upwards of a century since it had ceased to exist separately from Newcastle. However, circumstances did not then favour the undertaking, and it was postponed to a more convenient period; when, unexpectedly, towards the middle of this year, various and weighty reasons tended to bring it about. These were at once submitted to the Bishop, who, in a letter dated the 21st of June in this year, in general terms approved of the undertaking, to which his Lordship afterwards, at his residence at Darlington, and again on the feast of St. James the Apostle, at the college of St. Cuthbert, Ushaw, gave his particular sanction, and commissioned me, your unworthy servant, to organise subscriptions for that purpose in the whole town of Gateshead. Nor did I for one moment delay, but at once ordained a general and perpetual collection to be made for this object, beginning from the labouring classes at the rate of one shilling per month, and so in proportion to the wealth and means of each one. . . .

If the standard of Jesus floats aloft to encourage us, it is no solitary ensign; for in its company is the banner of our Lady, the protectress of Gateshead, and that of the holy Northumbrian prelate, St. Wilfrid, the patron of our future church. Already has the protection of these great saints been experienced; for we have, in the teeth of seeming difficulties, obtained from the lord of the manor of Gateshead half an acre of freehold ground in the very centre of the town, at an expense of 800*l.*, every farthing of which must be paid before one stone is allowed to be put in the ground, which should urge you on to greater exertions in the cause. But lest you should weary and grow cold through hope too long deferred, I, not unmindful of the history of our ancestors in the faith,

and more especially having before the eyes what the sainted Bishop Paulinus did in propagating the faith in Northumbria, have determined to walk in their footsteps: for we read in the *Ecclesiastical History* of the Venerable Beda, that when King Edwin and all his people were baptised by the holy Bishop at York, the sacrament of faith was administered in the church of St. Peter the Apostle, which the king had caused to be hastily built of wood, when he was instructed and baptised in the faith; but that, as soon as he was baptised, he took care, at the suggestion of Paulinus, to build a larger basilica of stone in the same place, in which the wooden oratory he had first constructed was included.

Acting, then, in accord with the council I have selected for the perfection of this work, I have, with the episcopal sanction, determined on the erection of a wooden church, in which the holy sacrifice may be offered up, and all other ecclesiastical functions be duly performed, until such time as we shall be in a position to build a church of stone. So, in like manner, until the parochial residence can be erected, I have thought well to fix it for the present in the new street of St. Catharine, which, being in the centre of the parish, can easily be reached by all. Matters being thus disposed, I trust I shall be able to be in the midst of you in the space of three months; but the necessary furniture of the oratory and parochial residence will necessitate a sum at the very least amounting to 200*l*. But, my brethren, since the Apostles did not consider it fitting that they should leave the Word of God, and minister at tables, and as the priesthood is set apart for the assistance of the Episcopacy in the administration of the Word and Sacraments, you will not expect that I, already overburdened with spiritual cares, should myself come amongst you to collect your alms and decimal contributions. With regard to the first, you will bear in mind what the Christians of Antioch did in favour of their poorer brethren of Judea, the disciples, every man according to his ability, sending relief to them by the hands of Barnabas and Saul; and with regard to the second, you will remember the precept of the Apostle to the Church of Corinth, "concerning the collections that are made for the saints, as likewise he had given orders to the Churches of Galatia, so also he prescribed for them, on the first day of the week, that every one should put apart with himself, laying up what it should well please him, that when he came, the collections should not then have to be made." Furthermore, brethren, you will remember, that what the Apostle leaves thus to the good-will of each one, the Church in her legislative capacity has subsequently fixed at a tenth of our substance, or fruits. My collectors, then, will continue to receive your regular contributions for the work, and the members of my council will solicit the alms of the faithful in the neighbouring cities and towns; whilst those who are at a distance will not fail, on knowing that you number between two and three thousand souls without a resident priest, and that there are few amongst you whom Heaven has blessed with ample means—they, I say, will not fail to send opportune succour to you in your need. I, on my part, will not cease to beseech Heaven in your behalf, and will weekly offer up the sacrifice of the immaculate Lamb for those who assist in the good work until its completion; and after that, monthly, for all benefactors living and dead, as long as it may please our heavenly Father to vouchsafe to me the use of my faculties. Nor will you be unmindful of the alms of prayer; but will bear in mind that we have a great work in hand, and that, if God is for us, who shall be against us? Omit not, brethren, also to pray for me, your unworthy but devoted servant. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all, brethren.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

POPULAR SERVICES.—“Y.” Our esteemed correspondent has, with some others, overlooked certain statements in the article in question, and has attributed to its author an object at which he was far from aiming. If he will return to our pages, he will find that it was said that Vespers *are* in universal use on the Continent in *cathedral, collegiate, and monastic* churches, and that they are sung in various others *also*. France in particular was specified as a country where parochial vespers are common. The Roman vespers were also referred to. We admit, however, that the *extent* of their use ought to have been more fully explained. The opinion of the writer of the article, that Latin vespers are not likely to become generally *congregational* in England, grounded on the fact that they are not so abroad, remains untouched. On the shewing of our correspondent himself, France is the only country where the people heartily *adopt* the Latin vespers-service. In other countries where vespers are common the congregations merely listen to them as in England.

We must also remind our correspondent, that it was implied that vespers *do* form a part of the services of the Oratorian churches in our express statement that they do so in all *collegiate and monastic* churches. As to any thing like an “anti-vesper movement,” nothing could be more foreign to the views advocated in the article. So far from it, its aim was to suggest a method for *improving* the singing of vespers, by discontinuing them where they are *already* found to be a failure as a “congregational” service, that by uniting scattered forces they might be sung well in as many churches as possible. Of course, it is nothing more than our own opinion that such a course *would* tend to the improvement of vespers. Still, we do so think, believing that the surest method for making vespers at once general and congregational is to sing them thoroughly well. Let them only be sung as they ought to be in a few churches, and far more would be done towards their ultimate general adoption in towns and cities than can ever be expected from the practice of introducing them at once into a voiceless congregation, and thus prejudicing all but the more cultivated few against so exquisite a service. That such a method *would* succeed in towns, where the people are more quick and intelligent than in villages, we fully believe. English people can be best led, in music as in other things, by example. It is vain to try to persuade the immense majority of persons that vespers *may be* made as magnificent as they are now often made ridiculous. But let them once hear them really sung to the genuine tones, in the true style, by a large congregation, and a love for the service will immediately follow. That a *good* vespers-service is *now* practicable in Catholic churches generally, for ourselves, we do not believe. In some it is so; and if it were in such cases cultivated to the highest point attainable, in the course of a few years a most striking general improvement would probably be the result. That the English *agricultural* poor will *ever* be brought to sing vespers congregationally, we venture to re-express our doubts.

END OF VOL. VI.

